

F  
67  
W83

MASSACHUSETTS  
MEMORIAL STATUES  
AT  
WASHINGTON.



Class F67

Book W 83

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

*Chap. 25.8*

*Shelf*

PRESENTED BY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.









SENATE.....

.....No. 3.

## REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

TO PROCURE

## MEMORIAL STATUES

FOR THE

NATIONAL STATUARY HALL AT  
WASHINGTON.

25.8

1876.



BOSTON:

ALBERT J. WRIGHT, STATE PRINTER,  
79 MILK STREET (CORNER OF FEDERAL).

1877.

F<sub>67</sub>  
W<sub>83</sub>

814849

c c c  
c c c



SAMUEL ADAMS.

ANNE WHITNEY,  
Sculptor.









JOHN WINTHROP.

RICHARD S. GREENOUGH,  
Sculptor.







## Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

---

### REPORT.

---

*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:*

The undersigned, Commissioners to provide for the erection of memorial statues of Massachusetts citizens at the National Capitol, respectfully submit their first and final Report.

Upon the completion of the Capitol at Washington, the old hall of the House of Representatives was left unappropriated to any specific use; and Congress, by the Act of July 2, 1864, set it apart "as a National Statuary Hall," authorizing the President "to invite each and all the States to provide and furnish statues, in marble or bronze, not exceeding two in number from each State, of deceased persons who have been citizens thereof, and illustrious for their historic renown or from distinguished civic or military service, such as each State shall determine to be worthy of this national commemoration."

In his last inaugural message, January 6, 1865, Governor Andrew, passing from topics that were pressing, "at a period so stirring to the heart, when every duty is sublime," thus commenced the closing passage of his eloquent address:—

"The old hall of the House of Representatives at Washington, with which is associated the fame, the wisdom and the eloquence of so many American statesmen, has been set apart by Congress for a National Gallery of Statuary, commemorative of citizens illustrious for their historic renown or distinguished civic or military service, whose careers on earth have ended. Each State will be invited to

furnish two statues in marble or bronze. Many years will elapse before this gallery of historic art will be complete. But there are already names, ample in number, belonging to history, and forming a part of the renown of our ancient Commonwealth,—venerable names of men over whose graves retreating Time has long cast his shadow, and of whom such monumental commemoration would be worthy and becoming. I respectfully recommend the appointment of a commission, to report during the present session a plan of coöperation on the part of Massachusetts in this eminently patriotic national design."

In accordance with this recommendation, the governor was authorized, by chapter 61 of the Resolves of 1865, to appoint three persons to be commissioners, who should consider the provisions of the Act of Congress before referred to, and report to the governor such a plan, in compliance therewith, as they should deem advisable, "accompanying the report of a plan with such suggestions as they deem proper in reference to the eras in the history of the Commonwealth to be commemorated by the statues which it is proposed to erect."

February 15, 1865, Governor Andrew had sent a special message to the Senate, transmitting a communication received by him from the Department of State of the United States, covering a copy of a letter of Hon. Mr. Morrill of Vermont to the President, on the subject of an historical gallery of statuary. The message was referred to the Committee on Federal Relations, which reported the Resolve above cited, May 9, 1865. It will be observed that it directed the commissioners to report a plan to comply with the Act of Congress, by erecting statues commemorative of *eras* in the history of the Commonwealth, thus indicating the intent of the Legislature that certain epochs should first be determined on as worthy of this illustration, and that then the figures especially typical of those epochs should be selected for an enduring memorial.

June 23, 1865, Governor Andrew appointed Hon. Messrs. John G. Palfrey, Solomon Lincoln, and Richard Frothingham commissioners under the Resolve, whose report was transmitted to the Legislature by Governor Bullock, in a special message, February 16, 1866.] In it he says:—

“It will be perceived that the learned commissioners, in their report, have limited their discussion to the topic of the latter portion of the Resolve, and have treated the historic periods which should be selected for representation in these works of art, selecting also the men who may be supposed to have most fully expressed the action and character of those periods. I think it will be apparent that, for obvious reasons, their treatment of the subject could not well have gone beyond this limit.”

These “obvious reasons” are explained to be the uncertainty whether, if Massachusetts were to provide the two statues which had been requested, “the example would be followed by a considerable number of other States, and thus the ultimate completion of the enterprise confidently anticipated.” “In the meantime,” concludes His Excellency, “the report of the commissioners will prove interesting and instructive here.”

It could scarcely have been otherwise, considering the high character and ability of the commission, and especially the learning, candor, and familiarity with the famous worthies of Massachusetts, which characterize the historian of New England, and the historian of the rise of liberty in the republic. The commissioners say:—

“The heroic eras in a people’s history are those when extraordinary crises in public affairs have prompted to peculiarly hazardous and vigorous action. Of these, the history of Massachusetts presents four. 1. That of the colonization and settlement. 2. That of the revolution of the seventeenth century, when the government of King James the Second was overturned in the colony. 3. That of the revolution of the eighteenth century, terminating in the independence and organized nationality of the United States. 4. That of the revolution of the nineteenth century, subverting the rule of the slave power.

“The commissioners unanimously regard the first of the eras above designated as unquestionably demanding to be presented by Massachusetts for the proposed national commemoration.”

They regarded the second era,—the revolution of April, 1689,—as not exhibiting services and exploits so memorable as those of the two later periods, with which it came into comparison. The latter period,—the late war for the Union,

—the commissioners dismiss from their consideration, because “the time has not yet come for commemorating by statues the actors in this great drama.” For these reasons, the commissioners concluded that they were restricted to the era of colonization and the era of the American Revolution.

With respectful mention of the merits and services of Carver and Brewster, of Bradford, and Winslow, and Standish, who led the planters at Plymouth, the commissioners agree, that “John Winthrop, rather than any other man, represents the founders of Massachusetts,” and “do not hesitate to advise that one of the statues to be set up in the national hall, shall commemorate the period and services of the first John Winthrop.”

But, in turning to the era of the Revolution, the commissioners found themselves “confronted with numerous illustrious names, each deserving every honor that a grateful posterity can bestow.” They recite with discriminating eulogy, the services of Oxenbridge Thacher, Joseph Warren, Josiah Quincy, junior, Jonathan Mayhew, Samuel Cooper, Joseph Hawley, Benjamin Franklin, James Bowdoin, Samuel Adams, John Hancock and James Otis. But, again avowing their “sense of the delicacy of the task of passing a judgment on the comparative value of the services of eminent public servants,” Messrs. Palfrey and Lincoln find themselves unable to pass by, “as of secondary account, the claims” of John Adams,—“the only chief magistrate, except the son educated by him for greatness, that Massachusetts has yet given to the country.” They therefore recommend that he be selected as the representative of the State in the era of the Revolution.

In this recommendation, Mr. Frothingham was unable to concur, being “constrained to express the conviction that history points to Samuel Adams as the representative man of Massachusetts at the era of the American Revolution.” And he accordingly submitted Samuel Adams as the proper subject for the other statue.

As was apparently anticipated by Governor Bullock, no action was taken upon this report for some years.

In the meantime, several of the older States placed, or took steps to place, statues in the Memorial Hall. New York was represented by Alexander Hamilton and Governor George

Clinton; Connecticut erected statues of Jonathan Trumbull and Roger Sherman; Rhode Island bore to the Capitol the effigies of Roger Williams and Nathaniel Greene. These proud gifts were received by Congress with the honors due to patriotic States and illustrious memories. And, upon the presentation, in January, 1872, of the statue of Roger Williams, the famous founder of the Providence Plantations, Senator Anthony glowingly invokes "Massachusetts, pausing in the embarrassment of her riches, looking down the long list of her sons who, in arms, in arts, and in letters, in all the departments of greatness, have contributed to her glory, and with hesitating fingers selects two to represent that glory here."

The old Bay State could no longer delay her choice and preparations, when her children and neighbors had accepted the invitation of Congress as a precious privilege. At the legislative session of 1872, Mr. Frederic W. Lincoln of Boston offered an order upon the subject, which was referred to the Committee on Federal Relations, from which committee Mr. Lincoln made a report, April 17, 1872. After a condensed history of the matter, the report recommends a statue of Governor Winthrop, and a statue of Samuel Adams, declaring that "the present seems to be a good opportunity to do just but tardy homage to the name of this great patriot." And a Resolve to carry out these recommendations accompanied the report.

The Legislature readily concurred in the suggestion to provide a statue of Samuel Adams; but the journals of the two houses for that session show that there was an irreconcilable difference of opinion upon the point whether a representative of the colonial period should be taken from the leaders of the elder colony of Plymouth, or should be the first governor of the Massachusetts, into which, more powerful, prosperous and extensive, the colony of Plymouth was merged by the charter of William and Mary, after seventy-two years of separate existence. The difficulty was finally referred for adjustment to the undersigned, created a commission by chapter 64 of the Resolves of 1872, which, in the first Resolve, provided—

“That His Excellency William B. Washburn, Honorable Horace H. Coolidge, the President of the Senate, Honorable John E. Sanford, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with two members from each branch of the Legislature, to be selected by the presiding officers [George F. Richardson and Erastus P. Carpenter, of the Senate; Frederic W. Lincoln and John B. D. Cogswell, of the House], be appointed a commission to procure from Massachusetts artists two statues in marble or bronze, to be erected in the Capitol at Washington, as the contribution of this Commonwealth to the National Gallery.

“*Resolved*, That the commission procure, in the manner before provided, a statue of Samuel Adams, and a statue of either John Winthrop, John Carver, William Bradford, William Brewster, Miles Standish, or Edward Winslow, as may seem to them expedient, as fitting representatives of the colonial and revolutionary periods.

“*Resolved*, That the sum of thirty thousand dollars be placed at the disposal of the commission, and that His Excellency the governor be authorized to draw, from time to time, such amounts as may be required to defray the cost of the statues and other necessary expenses.”

And that amount was appropriated by chapter 360 of the Acts of 1872, and the appropriation was successively renewed in Acts of 1874, chapter 319; 1876, chapter 9.

The Commission was, by the Resolve, directed to procure a statue of Samuel Adams; and, upon its organization, a majority decided to procure a statue of John Winthrop. The Commission entered promptly upon its work, but was delayed by the time consumed in preparing models. It was directed by the law to procure these works of Massachusetts artists, and found in this injunction no difficulty. Three models for the statue of Adams were submitted to the Commission, which contracted with Miss Anne Whitney for the work. A contract was made with Richard S. Greenough to furnish the statue of Winthrop. The contracts were executed in duplicate, and the originals, in the possession of the Commission, have been deposited in the office of the state treasurer for inspection and preservation. The price of the Adams statue was \$10,500 in currency; that of the Winthrop statue was \$10,000 in gold. The Commission believe the price paid to have been a fair one, having taken some pains to inform

themselves as to the amounts paid on similar commissions. These sums included suitable pedestals, furnished by the artists, and the cost of transportation to this country.

It had been the hope of both artists to carve these statues in America, of Vermont marble, but they were unable to obtain suitable blocks, and reluctantly repaired to Italy, where the statues were cut. This necessity, however, occasioned no additional expense to the Commonwealth, except to protect its insurable interest whilst in process of transportation across seas. After their delivery, both statues were kept carefully insured until finally placed upon their pedestals in the Memorial Hall at the Capitol.

The statues were both delivered in Boston, and exhibited for a brief period in the vestibule of the Boston Athenæum, through the great courtesy of the proprietors, extended by the appropriate committee. It was thought proper that the Legislature and the people of Massachusetts should have ample opportunity of inspection, and that the Commission should have the benefit of public criticism before acceptance.

It is proper to mention that both statues were cut from blocks of the purest marble, and that no difficulty whatever has arisen with either artist, their engagements having been fulfilled with scrupulous fidelity.

The statues were unpacked in Boston, repacked for shipment to Washington, and there set up in Statuary Hall, under the direction of the Commission, and without the slightest injury. But the Commissioners felt themselves constrained to decline urgent applications to permit their exhibition at the Centennial Exposition, from fear of harm, the added expense of insurance, and as conceiving themselves devoid of authority.

The Winthrop statue having been first contracted for, was first delivered, and was received in Boston in February, 1876. Mr. Lincoln, of the Commission, accompanied it to its destination. It had been supposed that this statue would then be presented to Congress for the nation, but it was preferred by the Massachusetts delegation that the formalities should be deferred until the Adams statue also was at hand. The latter was delivered in Boston in June, 1876, and Messrs. Lincoln and Cogswell repaired to Washington early

in July, to receive it there and arrange for the presentation of both. It will be observed, however, by the accompanying correspondence, that the condition of the public business was such that the presentation was again necessarily postponed until the commencement of the December session, now near at hand.

The Commission considers itself now discharged of its trust, having placed the statues in position at the Capitol, ready for that formal offering to the nation which propriety and customary etiquette require from the accredited representatives of Massachusetts, and of which they will, no doubt, so acquit themselves as to gratify the Legislature and their constituency, the people, who are the donors.

#### COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

STATE HOUSE, BOSTON, July 10, 1876.

*To the Honorable Senators and Representatives of Massachusetts in the National Congress:*

The undersigned, under the provisions of chapter 64 of the Resolves passed by the General Court in the year 1872, were appointed a Commission to procure from Massachusetts artists two statues in marble or bronze to be erected in the Capitol at Washington, as the contribution of this Commonwealth to the National Statuary Hall, in response to the invitation by Congress in the Act approved July 2, 1864.

The Commission was directed to procure, in the manner before provided, a statue of Samuel Adams, and a statue of either John Winthrop, John Carver, William Bradford, William Brewster, Miles Standish, or Edward Winslow, as might seem to them expedient, as fitting representatives of the colonial and revolutionary periods.

Under the direction of this Resolve, the Commissioners contracted with Anne Whitney for a statue of Samuel Adams, and by virtue of the discretion vested in them, they procured from Richard S. Greenough a statue of John Winthrop, first governor of the Massachusetts Colony. Both the artists were born in Massachusetts, and both statues are in marble.

Having been received and accepted, the Commission has caused the statues to be placed in the Statuary Hall at the Capitol, ready for presentation to the nation. The Commission congratulate themselves that they are able to present the contribution of Massachusetts in the centennial year of the events with which the fame of Adams is so inseparably connected, and which were the natural and

glorious fruitage of the labors, sacrifice, and doctrines of Winthrop and his contemporaries of the Plymouth and the Massachusetts colonies.

Having progressed thus far in the discharge of the duty imposed upon us by the Commonwealth, we respectfully request you, its representatives in the National Congress, to call to the attention of that body the response of this State to its gracious invitation, in such time and manner and with such formality, as usage and propriety may seem to you to require, and your own good taste and judgment may commend. And we subscribe ourselves, very respectfully and truly, your obedient servants,

W. B. WASHBURN.

HORACE H. COOLIDGE.

JOHN E. SANFORD.

GEORGE F. RICHARDSON.

ERASTUS P. CARPENTER.

FREDERIC W. LINCOLN.

JOHN B. D. COGSWELL.

WASHINGTON, July 17, 1876.

GENTLEMEN:—We have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication, requesting us to present to the Congress of the United States the statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams, the contribution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to the National Statuary Hall in the Capitol. It is with great satisfaction we accept the trust imposed upon us, and we tender you the assurance that we shall perform cheerfully the duty with which we have been charged. The end of the present session of Congress is so near, and the business pending is so urgent, that we venture to postpone the presentation of the statues until the commencement of the next session.

With great respect, we remain, your most obedient servants,

GEORGE S. BOUTWELL.

H. L. DAWES.

J. K. TARBOX.

N. P. BANKS.

HENRY L. PIERCE.

WM. W. CRapo.

B. W. HARRIS.

CHARLES P. THOMPSON.

W. W. WARREN.

To the Hon. W. B. WASHBURN, HORACE H. COOLIDGE, JOHN E. SANFORD, GEORGE F. RICHARDSON, ERASTUS P. CARPENTER, FREDERIC W. LINCOLN, JOHN B. D. COGSWELL.

The other members of the delegation were temporarily absent from Washington.

The Commission has caused photographs of the statues to be taken, copies of which have been placed in the executive chambers at the state house.

All bills contracted by the Commission, including cost of statues, insurance, freight, labor, clerical services, draperies, travelling and incidental expenses, have been audited and paid. Of the original appropriation of \$30,000, there remains unexpended a balance of \$5,570.02, which, by the provisions of law, at the close of the year will lapse into the general funds of the state treasury.

The Commission apprehend they will be excused for adding that they believe they have executed the task imposed upon them by the Legislature of 1872 with a successful result. Not assuming to be themselves possessed of taste or knowledge in art, they are gratified at being able to report that these statues are highly commended by such as are acknowledged to be good judges of works of this character. The statues presented to Memorial Hall by the States, with perhaps a single exception, are the best in Washington; and among them, the offerings of Massachusetts, it may safely be said, are conspicuous for excellence. Through the kindness of Mr. Clark, the Superintendent of the National Capitol, they are admirably placed, and attract universal attention. The Commissioners who, on one of the most torrid days of the last sultry July, superintended the placing upon its pedestal, and the unveiling, of Miss Whitney's statue of Samuel Adams, could but be intensely gratified when the marble portraiture of the noble patriot was greeted with spontaneous cheers from the large gathering of intelligent spectators. We hazard little in declaring that, by the public and the press, it was pronounced a most vigorous and effective portrait statue.

The particular event which the artist has chosen to depict, as strikingly representative of the character of Sam Adams, is the last of the interviews which, at the head of the Boston town committee, he had with Governor Hutchinson in the council chamber of the old State House, on Tuesday, March 6, 1772, the day after the "Boston Massacre," to demand

the immediate removal of the troops to the Castle. John Adams, in his old age, wrote a most vivid description of those interviews. The same evasive answer was returned, as before, when Samuel Adams, rising to his full height and majesty, his frame quivering, yet steeled, with emotion, pointing at Hutchinson a finger that trembled with the very intensity of passion, said: "If you have the power to remove one regiment, you have the power to remove both. It is at your peril, if you refuse. The meeting is composed of three thousand people. They are becoming impatient. A thousand men are already arrived from the neighborhood, and the whole country is in motion. Night is approaching. An immediate answer is expected. Both regiments or none." The artist has selected the moment when Adams ceased to speak, and, with folded arms, defiantly awaits the answer. But Hutchinson was cowed. After a moment's hurried consultation with Colonel Dalrymple, the commander of the troops, he announced that the people's wish should be complied with, and Adams and his colleagues returned in triumph to the Old South.

The departure of the troops commenced next morning, and on Friday not a red-coat remained to insult the Bostonians by his hated presence. But Lord North always afterwards contemptuously styled these "Sam Adams' regiments."

John Winthrop is a favorite subject of our accomplished artist, Richard S. Greenough. Many years ago he sculptured the statue of Governor Winthrop in the chapel at Mount Auburn, where the earnest Puritan is represented in a sitting posture, with a volume upon his knees, apparently the Holy Scriptures, from which he is expounding. He is thus depicted as the elder or magistrate.

The statue of the Capitol pictures him as stepping from the ship's plank to the shore of Massachusetts. To his side he clasps the Bible, which was his chart of life; in his hand he bears the charter of the Bay, with its great seal, still to be found in the office of our secretary of state, the most precious muniment of the Commonwealth. Here he is the governor, the leader of the colony into the desolate land he is contemplating, majestic and serene, in the spirit of the lofty sentiment, ascribed to his son, soon to follow him to

America,—“I shall call that my country, where I may most glorify God, and enjoy the presence of my dearest friends.”

The Statue Commission, here closing its Report to the Legislature of 1877, upon the trust committed to it by the Legislature of 1872, ventures to present its congratulations that the grand old Commonwealth is represented in the Statuary Hall of the Republic by two so every way worthy of immortal honor as Winthrop, the founder, “a discreet and sober man, giving good example to all the planters, wearing plain apparel, ruling with much mildness, strict in the execution of justice,” a lover of that “kind of liberty wherewith Christ has made us free,” or as Adams, inheritor of the faith and spirit of the Puritans, nobler than any Roman of them all, despising luxury, yet a ruler of the rich, whose whole life is opulent of instruction and rebuke to the public men of our times, the pilot of the Revolution, who cherished civic liberty with an intense yet guarded love. On the 4th of July, 1795, as governor, it was his great privilege to lay the corner-stone of the state house in which the Legislature is convened. Perhaps no other man had done so much to make that day memorable and this edifice possible!

W. B. WASHBURN.  
HORACE H. COOLIDGE.  
JOHN E. SANFORD.  
GEORGE F. RICHARDSON.  
E. P. CARPENTER,  
FREDERIC W. LINCOLN.  
JOHN B. D. COGSWELL.

BOSTON, November 21, 1876.





MASSACHUSETTS STATUES  
CAPITOL.



IN MEMORIAL HALL.

WASHINGTON.



---

---

## A P P E N D I X .

---

### PROCEEDINGS IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

ON THE PRESENTATION OF THE MEMORIAL STATUES OF JOHN  
WINTHROP AND SAMUEL ADAMS, CONTRIBUTED TO  
THE NATIONAL STATUARY HALL BY THE  
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,

DECEMBER 19, 1876.

---

---



## SENATE.

---

### REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE S. BOUTWELL, OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate to the statues that have been contributed by the State of Massachusetts to the old hall of the House of Representatives.

Speaking for my colleague as well as for myself, in behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and by the authority of its commissioners, we now present to the Senate and to the country the statue of John Winthrop, the father, founder, and first governor of the Puritan Colony of Massachusetts; and the statue of Samuel Adams, the earnest advocate, the most logical exponent and defender of the principles of the American Revolution.

The history of Massachusetts begins with the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth in the year 1620, and gathering as in one view all those who in the long period of two and a half centuries have contributed to the prosperity, asserted the liberties, defended the rights, supported the principles, advanced the honor, or extended the renown of that ancient Commonwealth, John Winthrop and Samuel Adams have been selected as most worthy of place in the illustrious group now assembling in the old hall of the House of Representatives of the United States.

The first choice was made from the men of the colonial period of our history, and the second from the men of the revolutionary era.

In the selection of a person to represent the colonial period there was a difference of opinion between the descendants of the Pilgrims and the descendants of the Puritans; but when the concession was made to the Massachusetts Colony there was no difference as to the person entitled to the high distinction of the first choice, and John Winthrop stands as the representative not only of colonial Puritan Massachusetts, but in his principles, ideas, and purposes in government, he stands as the representative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as it has been, as it is, and as it ever must continue to be.

The Pilgrims came to Plymouth to secure and enjoy religious free-

dom ; the Puritans came to Salem and Boston to found a Christian commonwealth and to extend a Christian civilization.

The Pilgrims had a higher idea of the right and dignity of man ; the Puritans had a broader view of the power of Christianity in the public affairs and concerns of mankind. The success of the Pilgrims has been full and complete, not only within the little colony which they founded at Plymouth, but for all the English-speaking States of America.

As religious liberty is the basis of the higher and purer forms of Christian civilization, the Puritans were compelled, finally, to accept the leading idea of the Pilgrims as a part of their public policy, and essential to their undertaking. Thus the principles of the Pilgrims and the purposes of the Puritans were blended into a public policy of religious and political freedom and equality, destined to be as extensive as the civilization and as enduring as the institutions of this continent.

In 1630, the Puritans in England were a class, but not a sect. They sought a better life, but they did not demand unity of opinion in religious affairs. Generally, they condemned the practices and ceremonies of the Church of England, but many of them accepted its creed and participated in its sacraments.

Winthrop and his associates in their letter of farewell say we “ esteem it our honor to call the Church of England, from whence we rise, our dear mother, . . . ever acknowledging that such hope and faith as we have obtained in the common salvation we have received in her bosom.”

In 1630, the Puritans were a large minority, if they did not constitute a majority, of the people of England ; but they had not then sought power nor agreed upon a public policy. In 1640, ten years after Winthrop’s departure, the great contest between the church and the Puritans, the king and the people, became active and the peril imminent.

The people protested against the Catholic and against the English Church. Fifteen thousand of the inhabitants of London and seven hundred clergymen of the Established Church asked that the powers of the bishops and the character of the ceremonies might be radically changed. These concessions were made in form and to some extent in fact.

Political changes in the nature of revolution followed. Strafford was executed, the court of high commission was broken up, the Star Chamber was abolished, the judicial department was separated from the Crown, taxation by the king was relinquished, all ending in the trial and execution of Charles I.

The reign of English Puritanism was brief ; but brief as was its

career and sudden as was its fall, it left traces of its influence and the footmarks of its power, not only in England, but in France, Germany, Switzerland, Spain, and the Low Countries, in the West Indies and the colonies on the continent of America.

The administration of Cromwell forms the most brilliant epoch in British history. He advanced the power and elevated the name of his country wherever it was known. His qualities as a statesman, soldier, and diplomatist were respected or feared in Western Europe and in the European settlements of America. His policy, compared with that of the past, was liberal and wise. He broke at once from the leading-strings of kingcraft and monopoly and put the government of England upon a more liberal policy, and prepared the people to receive more liberal ideas. But twenty years spent in strife, in civil war, in the discussions of questions of policy, foreign and domestic, had robbed Puritanism of its power as the advocate of a better religion.

Cromwell left England greater than he found it, and the England of to-day owes much to his administration; but the influence of the Puritanism of the seventeenth century is no longer visible in the politics or civilization of that country. Its moral power was destroyed in the effort to establish its authority by force.

In the little colony of Massachusetts its authority was not questioned seriously, either in the church or the state; and never on this continent did Puritanism seek to propagate its opinions or gain power by arms. In one particular the Puritans have been misunderstood.

They accepted the truth that there might be a state without a king or a bishop, but they did not realize the kindred truth that there might be a state without a church and a creed. They did not deny the right of private judgment in religious matters, but in their system of government the state and the church were one, and whatever disturbed the peace of the church in their view, also endangered the existence of the state. If the otherwise fair fame of the Massachusetts Puritans suffers from the charge of persecution, it is to be said in palliation, if not in justification, of their conduct, that it was not their purpose to compel others to conform to their opinions, but to save their state from the dangers to which they thought it exposed.

Of Winthrop even more might be said. In 1642, and in his capacity as governor of the colony, he received with kindness and gave aid and comfort to one La Tour, a Roman Catholic, who arrived at Boston from Rochelle, in France. His conduct was the occasion of severe criticism, but in his defence he says, "If there were not other sins which God may have a controversy with us for, I should little fear any harm from this."

But it can with truth be said of the Puritan colony and of its administration, that the public-school system, established in 1642, is based upon the distinct assertion of the right of private judgment in religious matters. If we consider the public school as the only contribution made by the Puritans, it is in the fact and in the ideas which it embraces, the most important contribution to the human race ever made by any set or body of men. It is, at once and always, better security than can be otherwise obtained for freedom of opinion in all things, for equality of rights in all the relations of life, for the diffusion of the spirit of justice, and a capacity for right-doing without the intervention of law, and at last for governments of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I cannot doubt that John Winthrop is the most important figure in American colonial history. His fortune in England was ample to supply the wants and to support the house of a country gentleman. He was in the practice and in the enjoyment of the income of an honorable profession. When he identified himself with the colony and accepted the office of governor, the most important step, indeed the saving step, was taken in support of the enterprise. During the winter of 1629-30, one-fifth of the settlers of Salem and Charlestown died of exposure and disease. The survivors did not number more than three hundred, and these were broken and disheartened, and filled with the gravest apprehensions for the future. Several of the settlements had been abandoned, and the very existence of the colony was in peril. Winthrop brought with him about one thousand persons, chiefly immigrants from Suffolk County, and they were re-enforced in the next twelve months by at least a thousand more.

These accessions were from the educated, competent, self-sustaining classes. In six years, and in their capacity as a colony, they founded and organized the college at Cambridge. In six years more they passed the memorable ordinance establishing a system of universal education, which is in itself an effectual refutation of the exaggerated eulogy which Buckle has pronounced upon Adam Smith. In thirteen years after the arrival of Winthrop, upon his suggestion, and largely under his guidance, the colonies of Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven entered into a union for mutual protection, which was the type of the confederation and of the Union of the American States.

Winthrop was governor twelve years of the nineteen years of his life in the colony, and there appear to have been but slight interruptions to his authority in the management of public affairs. His religious character and life, his devotion to the interests of the colony, his wisdom, his spirit of conciliation, his power of statement, and his rare ability in argument, gave him the post of leader with-

out a rival. Indeed, Washington is not more exalted among his associates of the revolutionary period than is Winthrop above his associates of the colonial.

The statue of John Winthrop is the contribution of the State of Massachusetts. If the influence of his life and opinions and of the institutions which he aided in founding were limited to that Commonwealth, it would be an inadequate recognition of the value of his example. The little colony which Winthrop founded was the germ of a new civilization—a civilization whose chief force lay in ideas. These ideas have subjugated States, advanced across a continent, and are now in actual contact with the older civilization of the Asiatic world. In the opinion that this new civilization is an improved civilization we can assert that other States and even other countries are bound with Massachusetts to recognize the services and to extend the fame of John Winthrop.

#### REMARKS OF HON. HENRY L. DAWES, OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President, there has been no hesitation in the delay of Massachusetts to respond to the invitation of the nation to furnish for the old hall of the House of Representatives, “statues of two of her deceased citizens, illustrious for their historic renown or distinguished for their civic or military services and most worthy of such a national commemoration.”

It was no easy task for her to so execute this national commission as to command the approval of the present, and bear the test of future generations, as she turned for that purpose to the long line of her illustrious citizens who had closed lives full of immortal deeds, and conspicuous in history for the rarest virtues.

It was only after much deliberation that she made her selection of the first colonial governor of Massachusetts Bay, illustrious both as the founder of her civil polity and as the father of a long line of her citizens distinguished in each successive generation for eminence in talent, virtue, and patriotism,—and still most potential among her people for all that is good and worthy of renown,—and with him one, *primus inter pares* among those great leaders who, a century and a half after her Puritan governor, guided that colony and her twelve sisters through revolution to free and independent States and to their position as one among the nations of the earth. Massachusetts accordingly presents this day to the nation, to be preserved among those of the illustrious dead of her sister States, in that old hall, itself immortal, the statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams, the one first in her colonial, and the other first in her revolutionary history. In the discharge of the agreeable duty thus imposed by her

upon her representatives here, it has fallen to my lot to speak of the character of Samuel Adams.

He was born in Boston on the 16th of September, 1722, O. S., in the third generation, in direct line from that John Adams who was the great-grandfather of the illustrious patriot and citizen bearing the same name, the second President of the United States. In 1736, he entered Harvard College, and graduated in regular course in 1740; commenced, but did not pursue, the study of the law, entered a counting-house and adopted mercantile business for his pursuit in life, from which, however, he was early turned by the stirring events destined soon and completely to absorb his whole being and control his whole future. He was twice married; first to Miss Elizabeth Checkly, and afterward to Miss Elizabeth Wells. By the former he had five children, only one of whom survived him. He died in the town of his birth, as he had always lived, in poverty, October 2, 1803, at the age of eighty-one years.

Such is the simple and naked record of his birth, life, and death, carefully and unostentatiously traced, as is the custom of the New England family, in the Bible that comes down from father to son, preserving between the books of the Old and New Testaments the genealogy of the families through which it passes, and whose religious character it feeds and supports.

If from this simple page we turn to the *story* of his life, it will be found to have been one of the most eventful, influential, and positive of all the lives of the great men who, under Providence, moulded and determined the destiny of this nation, out of small beginnings, through feeble instrumentalities, and sometimes by mysterious agencies, but at all times by a wisdom and forecast, by a consecration and sacrifice little short of superhuman.

As his life began, so did his work, earlier than that of any of those who worked with him to the final consummation. As early as 1743, thirty-three years before the Declaration of Independence, and when the surface of absolute British rule on this continent had not as yet been ruffled by the slightest breeze of popular discontent, on the occasion of his master's oration at college, he, then just entering on his majority, disturbed the repose of the colonial governor and his subservient council by maintaining the thesis that "it is lawful to resist the supreme magistrate if the Commonwealth cannot be otherwise preserved." Thus early in his own life, and earlier than that of the nation he helped to create, for it was before the reign of George III. had begun, while Washington and John Adams were mere children, and Jefferson was an infant just born, did Samuel Adams, with a forecast then all his own, prepare the way for coming events whose shadow had not yet appeared. The spirit of the

Revolution seemed to have been born in him, and to have been cherished as a passion from his infancy. Yet he was the most patient of men, and awaited its development in others with the calmness and faith of a prophet.

The fire and zeal of the youth were held in check by the wisdom and prudence of maturity. He took on that day only the first step, the sacred *right* of revolution. But it was a step taken, taken firmly and intelligently, and thereafter maintained against all comers. From that day he seems to have consecrated himself to this new mission. Scarcely a trace of him remains elsewhere, or in any other pursuit. - An ineffectual effort at the bar, an unsuccessful mercantile venture, and all the rest of that remarkable life was one of harmonious growth and wonderful development of the germ which that day put forth its first sign of life. And how marvellously it took root and grew in that genial soil! Though beset on all sides with discouragement and obstacles, confronted with opposition and loaded with obloquy, in perils often from open foes and among false brethren, yet his heart never failed him in his work, and never for an instant did he give over effort till the final and glorious consummation gladdened his eye and ravished his soul.

Nevertheless, for thirty long years from that day, it was mostly a work of preparation, ripening only by slow progress and at an almost imperceptible pace into organization, leading ever, though not always by the open way, to that actual resistance from which there could be no retreat, and whose successful issue he never doubted. These were the most remarkable and eventful years of his life, and of the life of any American, save Washington, yet born. Indeed, every hour of revolutionary research makes it more and more apparent that had there been no Samuel Adams, there had been no Washington. The Father of the Revolution must needs precede the Father of his Country.

In his work he was not always understood, and was often misunderstood; but he stopped not to explain, and wasted no time or strength in vindication.

Recognized by the unerring instinct of the people, from the moment that progress ceased to be silent and unseen and the gathering forces assumed order and direction, unappointed and without other commission than comes in great emergencies from commanding talent, unfaltering faith, and cloudless vision, he stood at all times at the head of the column pointing the way. He constantly encouraged the wavering, urged on the bold, and dispelled the clouds that darkened the path, till the surcharged elements of revolution broke with the clash of arms on the 19th of April, 1775.

In the early morning of that day, forewarned, he left, in company

with John Haneock, his retreat in the town of Lexington as the approaching tread of pursuing soldiers was heard in the distance. But the hour of resistance had come, and the curtain seemed for a moment to lift from the future, and its coming glories to open before him. Turning toward the first gray of the morning, as it began to light up the eastern sky and direct their unattended footsteps, he exclaimed to his companion, "What a glorious morning is this!"

In that period of his life which preceded the open outbreak of hostilities, there can be no doubt, I think, that his most important work was done. On this his fame will in the future rest. As its difficulties and complications, its delicate and doubtful methods, its incessant labor and sleepless vigilance, all dominated by one great idea, and pressed forward with an unflinching courage, shall come to be better known by the student of the causes and instrumentalities of which the Revolution was born, so will its lustre constantly increase. No adequate sketch even of that work can be attempted here.

Bancroft has truly said that—

"It is impossible to write the history of the American Revolution without the character of Samuel Adams, and it is impossible to write the life of Samuel Adams without giving a history of the Revolution, for he was the father of the Revolution."

A bare outline would extend these remarks beyond justifiable limit, and only a few prominent points can be touched upon in years crowded with efforts the most efficient, well directed, and successful in awakening, educating, organizing, and inspiring the spirit of the Revolution.

He had scarcely attained his majority and stirred the blood of his rulers by the "incipient treason," as it was called, which lurked in his last college effort, when, recognizing the press as the most essential and efficient instrumentality in any great work dependent upon the popular will, he induced a few of his political friends to form a club for the special consideration of public affairs. By writing and debate and the establishment of a newspaper he endeavored to disseminate among the people the opinions and discussions of this club. The "Public Advertiser," whose first number was published in Boston, January 1, 1748, thus became the organ of the first political association in the colonies for the promulgation of those principles which led in after years to the American Revolution.

Samuel Adams was the leader and master-spirit among this bold and efficient band of pioneers. He was henceforward a most able polit-

ical writer, not only for this paper, but in the columns of every other paper in New England to which he could gain access, and over a great number of different signatures, that he might not appear to the people to be working single-handed, but as one of many able and cogent writers upon subjects every hour pushed home to the public conscience and judgment with increasing force. His political writings during this period would, if it were possible to rescue them from oblivion, fill many volumes, and would now be of immense value to the student of political history and to a just estimate of the men and measures of that epoch. But from various causes the larger part of this invaluable treasure has been lost. The great variety of names under which they appeared from time to time, and the necessity of concealment to the personal safety of their author growing more and more an object of anxiety and care as troubles thickened, and the carelessness of subsequent custodians having no conception of their value, have all contributed to the loss of a large part of the writings of the ablest political philosopher and statesman of that critical and important period. But enough of them have survived in all the casualties which their author's fame has encountered in revolutionary times to justify the high estimate which the future generations of the Republic are sure to put upon them.

It was the wont of the towns in the Massachusetts Province to furnish their representatives to the General Court with written instructions, some of which were very elaborate and able. Those for the year 1764 from the town of Boston were from the pen of Mr. Adams, and were remarkable for the boldness with which new ideas were enunciated and the measures suggested for their maintenance. Says Mr. Adams :—

“We, therefore, your constituents, take this opportunity to declare our just expectations of you that you will constantly use your power and influence in maintaining the invaluable rights and privileges of the province of which this town is so great a part, as well as those rights which are derived to us by the royal charter as those which, being prior to and independent of it, we hold essentially as freeborn subjects of Great Britain.”

And the instructions conclude with this, in the light of subsequent events, most important suggestion :—

“As His Majesty's other North American colonies are embarked with us in this most important bottom, we further desire you to use your endeavors that their weight may be added to that of this province, that, by the united application of all who are aggrieved, all may obtain redress.”

This was in 1764, ten years before the first meeting of the colonies in Carpenter's Hall in consultation for the common welfare, and is believed to be the earliest suggestion of the Union through which all our glories have arisen. In the next year he held the General Court of the colony up to resolve, "that there are certain essential rights of the British constitution of government which are founded in the law of God and nature, and are the common rights of mankind"; and "that the inhabitants of this province are unalienably entitled to these essential rights in common with all men, and that no law of society can, consistent with the law of God and nature, divest them of these rights."

These now fundamental doctrines of our polity were then so new that they "startled the whole province," and we are told that they were received in England as the "ravings of a parcel of wild enthusiasts."

His pen was constantly active in all the following years, feeding the growing popular excitement and leading the public mind and heart, unconsciously for a time, perhaps, but steadily and step by step, up to the one great act from which there could be no retreat with life and honor.

In 1768, Mr. Adams prepared the celebrated letter of instructions from Massachusetts to her agent in London, which was published in England as the "true sentiments of America," and also addresses in the name of that colony to the ministry and to the friends of America in the mother country, and a circular letter to each legislative assembly on this continent. Thus all along, and almost in the same breath, did he exhort and encourage the people at home, enlighten and remonstrate with the Government abroad, and appeal to the sister colonies for union and resistance. As early as this year, eight years before the final declaration, Mr. Adams became convinced that the policy of Great Britain toward the colonies was unalterable, and that independence or slavery was the alternative before the Anglo-Saxon race on this continent. He did not hesitate himself, nor for a moment doubt the choice of the people, so soon as they should see clearly as he did that the choice must be made. From that hour, more or less openly and positively, but never faltering or retreating, he addressed himself to the removal of all doubts and to the clearing of the mists from all visions. How far in advance of all others he was in this great work, those can judge who remember that John Adams and Jefferson for years afterward were laboring for a solution, short of separation, of the questions which had arisen between the mother country and her colonies; and Washington himself confessed, only two months before the Declaration was adopted, that when he

took command of the Army, July 2, 1775, he “ abhorred the idea of independence.”

When the massacre of unarmed citizens in the streets of Boston by British troops quartered in town by a cowardly governor had aroused the people to a pitch of excitement bordering on madness, and had crowded the Old South Church with an assembly of men burning with indignation, Samuel Adams was put at the head of a committee to demand again of the governor, in the name of an outraged people, a removal of the troops, which that morning he had refused to the town authorities. The meeting in solemn silence awaited the result of the mission with intense anxiety. The first report that one regiment might be removed had been met by a response from three thousand voices, making the very roof of that venerable edifice to shake, that every soldier must depart.

Mr. Adams, at the head of a new committee, returned to deliver to the quaking governor this response. The scene in the council chamber where he presented to the governor and the commanders of the regiments the reply of the meeting is the most impressive scene of all the Revolution. The orator, stretching forth his hand, like Paul before the trembling Felix, said:—

“ It is the unanimous opinion of the meeting that the reply to the vote of the inhabitants in the morning is by no means satisfactory; nothing less will satisfy them than a total and immediate removal of the troops. If you have power to remove one regiment, you have power to remove both. It is at your peril if you refuse. The meeting is composed of three thousand men. A thousand men are already arrived from the neighborhood, and the whole country is in motion. Night is approaching; an immediate answer is expected. Both regiments or none!”

There was no mistaking this determined spirit, and the governor, quailing before it, gave the order for the removal of the troops.

The artist has chosen for reproduction in marble, from among all the eventful scenes in the life of this remarkable man, the moment of the utterance of these words, the reply to which was awaited by Mr. Adams, calmly, with folded arms and with compressed lips and firmly knitted brow. And to all coming generations, while one stone shall remain upon another around that historic hall, shall this marble thus commemorate the courage and heroism to which British authority first surrendered on this continent.

But in the years that immediately followed, the great power of Mr. Adams as a leader of the people was even more manifest than when he appeared, in the morning of that eventful day, controlling the tempest of popular passion in Faneuil Hall and the Old South Church, and in the evening confronting and overawing royal

authority and insolence. Great depression followed this intense excitement. Reaction had set in, and the people had begun to falter. Elliott said that "it might be as well not to dispute in such strong terms the legal right of Parliament." James Otis, jealous of Samuel Adams, placed obstacles in his way; and even John Adams, retiring from the Colonial Legislature as if to private life, ceased to write in the cause, "disgusted with the apparent subsidence of the patriotic spirit." The Legislature itself, abandoning the lead of Adams, followed that of the doubting and hesitating, and he was left in the minority. The loyalists were exultant and the patriots disheartened. Then the resolute soul of this great man lifted him to the height of the occasion, and with pen and voice and personal argument, 'mid obstacles almost insurmountable, he kindled afresh the fires of the Revolution, and inspired with new animation and hope and courage the desponding spirit of patriotism.

The people rallied, the dead-point was passed, and the danger was escaped. A weak man may float with the current, a stout one only can stem it.

From this time forward he labored incessantly for union, as in one common cause, of all who complained of despotic rule; first for a general league of Massachusetts towns, and later, as the cause broadened, in an earnest and formal call for a Continental Congress.

In March, 1774, more than two years before the immortal Declaration, in the spirit of prophecy, he wrote to Arthur Lee, in England, that by persistency of the British government in its course "will be brought to pass the entire separation and independence of the colonies."

Hutchinson had, nearly a year before, reported him to Lord Dartmouth as the chief incendiary, "determined to get rid of every governor obstructing their course to independency."

He stands out in the history of the progress of the great struggle, not only as among the very earliest in resistance to British aggression, but the first to see the futility of all attempts at compromise, and to proclaim that the hour for separation had come. He moves in the Colonial Legislature the appointment of delegates to a Continental Congress in Philadelphia. The royal governor in alarm attempts to dissolve the assembly, but the door is locked in his face, and the key is in the pocket of Mr. Adams. His leadership was as well understood in England as at home, and it won for him, with Hancock, the immortal distinction of being exempted by name from an otherwise general offer of pardon upon submission to royal authority. In all the sessions of the Continental Congress he was, as at home in Massachusetts, a leader in counsel and in labor, guiding constantly toward and striving ever to reach that day

when formal and irrevocable proclamation of independence could be made.

He bore a most conspicuous part in the final production and adoption of that great instrument, and affixed his name to it as the fruition of years of prayer and struggle.

He returned to Massachusetts as poor as when contributions from unknown sources had furnished the very clothes which he wore in Philadelphia. And yet he had scorned the tempter, with the gold and the peerage of England in his hand. Incessant devotion to the public service and entire consecration of every energy to the cause of his country had wrought upon him poverty and need. He found himself without even the shelter of a roof he could call his own. He struggled with his necessities as best he could, but failed in his advanced age to better his fortunes, and continued to the end of his life to lack many of its comforts.

But he could not be kept from the service of the people, and entered at once into that of his native State, first as president of its Senate, and later as its governor for three successive terms, and retiring only under the burden and at the command of advancing age.

Mr. Adams was thoroughly democratic in all his instincts and faith. His trust in the people was implicit and unbounded. His political education and his early training as a statesman were, in the New England town-meeting, the nearest approach to the ancient democracy of any modern political institution, and largely through it he had seen wrought out the wonders of the Revolution. Therefore, that form of government for the future States which was the nearest approach to the democratic ideal won his warmest support. He accordingly, with others of the same school, shrank from the present Constitution, and was opposed to its ratification by Massachusetts as too centralizing, and as cramping the powers and functions of the States. It was only when that ratification was to be accompanied with proposed amendments, giving further guarantees to the liberties of the people and the powers of the States, that he finally saw his way clear to advise its adoption by his native Commonwealth.

The sincerity and weight of that advice contributed much to the ultimate adoption of that instrument, not only by Massachusetts, but by a sufficient number of her sister States also to make it ultimately the organic law of the land.

This tendency of his mind led him directly, in the division of the country at the end of Washington's administration into parties upon the different rules of construction of the Constitution and consequent differences in policies of administration, to take the side of Jefferson against his own kinsman and co-laborer, John Adams.

Age alone prevented him from becoming a member of Jefferson's first cabinet. A temporary estrangement between the two Adamses followed this political divergence. It was, however, soon forgotten, and the ex-president, surviving his elder compatriot many years, never stinted his appreciation and commendation of that undischarged debt this nation owes to him who was leader in all the great works of the Revolution.

Mr. Adams died at the age of eighty-one, in the fullness of his years, and with his work and fame complete. As they pass in review at the end of the century which their crowning glory ushered in, how grandly they stand out, foremost in the front rank! His was a great, and will ever remain an historic character, indissolubly linked with every critical, decisive, or glorious step in the progress of the Revolution, from the feebleness of its inception to the grandeur of its consummation. All his life-work led him through ways hitherto unmarked by the footsteps of the statesman and beset with perils, and he walked under a burden of responsibilities few if any others ever bore. On a single misstep hung the life of the nation; yet, in that wisdom and forecast, that boldness and strength, that power at his will alike to inspire and restrain, to stir the popular heart and to hold it in check,—essentials all to the success of the great work on hand,—he had no equal among the chiefs of the Revolution.

Massachusetts has been slow in doing honor to her illustrious son. But if she comes late to a public manifestation of her gratitude and appreciation, she has chosen well the manner and the occasion. At her command, one of her own artists, a lady of rising fame and great promise, has with marked success reproduced, in imperishable marble, the stately form and commanding features of the great popular leader. One hundred years in the history of the Republic he contributed so much to create have been numbered, and now his native Commonwealth is proud to bear witness at once to his love for her and to his greater love for the nation of which she was forever to be a part. To-day, in acknowledgment of a debt that can never be discharged, and full of pride in the name and fame of Samuel Adams, Massachusetts presents his statue to the United States, to be kept in perpetual trust as a memorial of her gratitude and a pledge of her fidelity to the cause of self-government, to which his whole life was consecrated.

#### REMARKS OF HON. JOHN J. INGALLS, OF KANSAS.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, I offer the Resolutions which I send to the desk to be read.

The Resolutions were read, as follows:—

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* 1. That the statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams are accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress are given to the State of Massachusetts for these memorials of two of her eminent citizens whose names are indissolubly associated with the foundation of the Republic.

2. That a copy of these resolutions, engrossed upon parchment and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Massachusetts.

**Mr. INGALLS.** There have been citizens of Massachusetts more illustrious for their historic renown, or from distinguished civic and military services, than those whom she has chosen as worthy of this national commemoration.

The stranger who pauses before the memorial marbles in future years may forget that Sumner and Wilson had so lately departed from this chamber that they could not become competitors for admission to that silent society of fame; but he will remember that our predecessors had heard the majestic periods of Webster, and the gorgeous rhetoric of Choate and Everett; that upon the floor he treads had fallen “the old man eloquent” at the close of a memorable career. The effigies of the revolutionary heroes around him will recall the memory of Hancock, the first signer of the Declaration of Independence, and of Warren, who died at Bunker Hill; while against the dark and stormy background of the desolate colonial epoch will appear in dim procession the names of Bradford, Winslow and Miles Standish, and he will ask why the old Commonwealth turned away from these conspicuous sons, and selected for this perpetual, enduring and eternal honor, as the representatives of her birth and growth; the exponents of her purposes and her convictions; the apostles of her mission and the prophets of her destiny, these less illustrious citizens,—John Winthrop and Samuel Adams.

The race to which we belong is characterized by resistless energy. Descending the slopes of the great central Asiatic plateau in prehistoric times, it has moved westward through Europe by some mysterious impulse, subverting empires, displacing populations, substituting languages, imposing new policies and institutions, and giving rise to an organic series of nations which have succeeded each other like the annual harvests of the earth. It was not till the seventeenth century that this great column, in its prodigious migration, reached the shores of America, and found here for the first time in its eventful march an unlimited field for unrestricted growth and development. To an unoccupied continent, whose river valleys and mountain ranges compel national unity, it brought the ideas which it has preserved amid all vicissitudes; ideas whose vigor had suc-

cessfully resisted the modifications of climate, soil and physical conditions; which had defied repression, and when restrained by power too great to be overcome, had preferred deserts and inhospitable solitudes, rather than enervating submission to tyranny. Refusing to adulterate its blood with inferior races, it had not degenerated nor lost its intellectual methods and traditions. It loved to make laws and then to render obedience to them. It preferred charters to the sword. It was profoundly religious, and expressed its faith in solemnities and creeds.

Since the Christian era, there have been no great political movements that have not had their impulse in religious sentiment. The idea of a Messiah has preserved the national existence of the Jews during two thousand years of persecution, and of dispersion to the uttermost parts of the earth. The dogmas of Mohammed changed the destiny of three continents. The protest of Luther against Romanism gave direction to the whole current of modern history. The Reformation gave the Commonwealth to England and the Puritan to America.

Foremost among these pioneers was John Winthrop, a voluntary exile, seeking unrestricted liberty of conscience. The little community that gathered around him necessarily assumed political relations. The idea of personal freedom and independence permeated the fabric and became its controlling impulse. As new colonies crossed the sea, the necessities of defence compelled an association upon the same principle, and when at last the exactions of England grew again to be intolerable, Samuel Adams became one of the apostles of the political gospel that all men were created equal.

In the interval that has followed the final removal of exterior obstacles, the ideas of Winthrop and Adams have advanced with inexorable vigor, subduing a continent for their habitation, and moulding with despotic sovereignty the institutions and laws of forty millions of men. It has been said that the Puritans came to America to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and to compel everybody else to do the same. Whether this be true or not, it is certain that the political system based upon the ideas of Winthrop and Adams has been inflexibly aggressive and intolerant. During the early years of the Republic it regarded with increasing discontent the advance of human slavery. Its opponents were not warned in time. Democracies are generous, but they are jealous. They endure much, but when they are wronged they sometimes take more than their due. When dissatisfaction assumes the form of resentment, one volume of a nation's history is closed and another is opened.

The irrepressible conflict was proclaimed and the contest waged

with increasing intensity. Political complications deferred the crisis till the issue was precipitated upon the plains of Kansas, and John Brown of Osawatomie there raised anew the standard of universal freedom, under which he marched to Harper's Ferry, and which the nation seized at the gallows of Charlestown and bore in triumph to Appomattox Court-house. Whatever may be said of the policy or experience of these great movements, history will not fail to record that those who inherited the political principles of Winthrop and Adams were inexorably logical and courageous, and that they shrank from none of the consequences of their convictions. They were not only determined to be free themselves, but that all who were accessible to their influence should be free also, whether they wanted to be or not. They promptly relinquished the rights of conquerors, and admitted the vanquished to the full exercise of unrestricted citizenship. Following their doctrines to their logical conclusions, they made citizenship national; they enfranchised the illiterate millions who had been relieved from bondage, and intrusted them with the ample prerogatives of freedom. It was a terrible experiment. Self-government was never subjected to such a stress before. Whether it will survive the shock remains to be determined. The portentous emergency that confronts us to-day is one of its inevitable results, and it will require the active coöperation of all the higher forces of society to prevent destructive organic changes.

The tendency of the democratic idea in America has not been destructive as in other countries. It has not striven to tear down, but to construct and build up; to repair, and not to waste. It has always exhibited an impulse toward the coalition of all its elements. Whether in the feeble days of the colonies or the succeeding era of our growth and glory, this instinct has always been visible, and it has developed into a purpose whose conservative and beneficent influence cannot be overestimated, not only in the present, but in all future crises that may threaten the nation. This purpose is national unity, the determination that the United States shall be a great continental republic, powerful and indissoluble, offering a refuge and asylum to all who love liberty, and sovereign among the nations of the world. To realize this sublime conception, incredible sacrifices have been made. Personal rights for a long period were cheerfully surrendered. Armies and navies have been organized for military and naval operations commensurable in magnitude with the great fields upon which they were conducted. Hundreds of thousands of lives have been sacrificed and hundreds of millions of treasure expended to establish the national integrity. It is not too much to say that this purpose is so deeply imbedded in the convictions of the American people that it can never be abandoned. It has cost too much

to be peacefully surrendered. We are now in a transition period. We have acquired a habit of subordination, and may confidently anticipate the acknowledged supremacy of law.

In view of these considerations, this interruption of the proceedings of the Senate in the presence of questions of momentous interest ceases to be inopportune or formal. It is an admonition of profound significance. Massachusetts turns from her warriors, her statesmen, her orators, and acknowledges her supreme allegiance to those potential ideas which for two hundred and fifty years have defined the path of her progress. She announces that against the temptations of policy or place or expediency she shall recognize morals as an element in politics and the golden rule as a maxim of government; that in the future as in the past she will insist upon national integrity, equality before the law, universal education, the elevation of the masses, the protection of labor, the promotion of the material interests of the country, and the continued activity of those great moral forces which underlie true national grandeur.

I move the adoption of the Resolutions.

The Resolutions were adopted unanimously.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

## REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE F. HOAR, OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. HOAR. I call up the special order fixed for to-day.

The SPEAKER. The Resolutions of the Senate will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:—

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, }  
December 19, 1876. }

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* 1. That the statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams are accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress are given to the State of Massachusetts for these memorials of two of her eminent citizens whose names are indissolubly associated with the foundation of the Republic.

2. That a copy of these resolutions, engrossed upon parchment and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Massachusetts.

Attest:

GEO. C. GORHAM,

By W. J. McDONALD,

*Chief Clerk.*

Mr. HOAR. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in obedience to the invitation of Congress, presents to the United States the statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams, to be placed in the old hall of the House of Representatives, and to be kept reverently in that beautiful and stately chamber so long as its columns shall endure.

Different kinds of public service, various manifestations of intellectual and moral greatness, have been held by different nations and ages to constitute the chief title to their regard. With all her wealth in other departments of glory, England chiefly values the men who have done good fighting in her great wars. Marlborough and Nelson and Wellington crown the stateliest columns in the squares and streets of her chief cities. When we would picture to ourselves the republics of Italy, four laurelled heads of famous poets stand out upon the canvas. The statue of Erasmus, the great scholar of Holland, with a book in his hand, looks down upon the

busy market-place of Rotterdam. The judgment of mankind has probably determined that, through the great jurists of the days of the empire, Rome has made her deepest impression on the world. The names of great soldiers, founders of nations, jurists, ministers of state, men of science, inventors, historians, poets, orators, philanthropists, reformers, teachers, are found in turn on the columns by which the gratitude of nations seeks to give immortality to their benefactors.

In deciding which of these classes should be represented, or who of her children in each is worthiest of this honor, Massachusetts has not been driven to choose of her poverty. Is the choice to fall upon a soldier? Sturdy Miles Standish, earliest of the famous captains of America—"in small room large heart inclosed"; Sir William Pepperell, the conqueror of Louisburg, may vie with each other for the glory of standing by the ever-youthful and majestic figure of Warren.

Would the reverence of the nation commemorate its founders? To the State made up of the blended colonies founded by Endicott and Winthrop, and the men who, on board the Mayflower, signed the first written constitution that ever existed among men, more than one-third of the people of the United States to-day trace their lineage.

No American State, no civilized nation, has contributed more illustrious names to jurisprudence than Parsons and Mason and Story and Shaw.

The long roll of her statesmen begins with those who laid the foundation of the little colony deep and strong enough for an empire. It will end when the love of liberty dies out from the soul of man. Bradford and Carver; Endicott and Winthrop; Vane, the friend of Milton and counsellor of Cromwell; Otis and Samuel Adams and Quincy and Hawley, the men who conducted on the side of the people that great debate by which the Revolution was accomplished before the first gun was fired; John Adams and his son, whose biographies almost make up the history of the country for eighty years; Pickering, who filled in turn every seat in the cabinet; Webster, the greatest teacher of constitutional law, save Marshall; Andrew, the great war governor; Sumner, the echoes of whose voice seem yet audible in the Senate Chamber, by no means make up the whole of the familiar catalogue.

Science will not disdain to look for fitting representatives to the State of Bowditch and John Pickering and Wyman and Peirce, and which contains the birthplace of Franklin and the home and grave of Agassiz.

Are we to hold with Franklin that the world owes more to great

inventors than to all its warriors and statesmen? The inventor of the cotton-gin, who doubled the value of every acre of cotton-producing land in the South; the inventor of the telegraph, at whose funeral obsequies the sorrow of all nations throbbing simultaneously around the globe was manifested; the discoverer of the uses of ether in surgery, who has disarmed sickness of half its pain and death of half its terrors, may dispute with each other a palm for which there will be no other competitors.

Among historians the names of Bancroft and Sparks and Motley and Prescott and Palfrey and Parkman will endure till the deeds they celebrate are forgotten. "Worthy deeds," said John Milton, "are not often destitute of worthy relators, as by a certain fate great acts and great eloquence have commonly gone hand in hand."

"Native to famous wits  
And hospitable, in her sweet recess,"

Massachusetts contributes to the list of poets who have delighted the world the names of Bryant and Emerson and Whittier and Longfellow and Lowell and Holmes.

Among the foremost of Americans in oratory, that foremost of arts, stand Quincy, the Cicero of the Revolution; Otis, that "flame of fire"; the persuasive Choate; the silver-tongued Everett; the majestic Webster.

Of the great lovers of their race, whose pure fame is gained by unselfish devotion of their lives to lessening suffering or reforming vice, Massachusetts has furnished conspicuous examples. Among these great benefactors who have now gone to their reward, it is hard to determine the palm of excellence. To the labors of Horace Mann is due the excellence of the common schools in America, without which liberty must perish, despite of constitution or statute.

If an archangel should come down from heaven among men, I cannot conceive that he could give utterance to a loftier virtue or clothe his message in more fitting praise than are found in the pure eloquence in which Channing arraigned slavery, that giant crime of all ages, before the bar of public opinion, and held up the selfish ambition of Napoleon to the condemnation of mankind. "Never before," says the eulogist of Channing, "in the name of humanity and freedom, was grand offender arraigned by such a voice. The sentence of degradation which Channing has passed, confirmed by coming generations, will darken the fame of the warrior more than any defeat of his arms or compelled abdication of his power."

Dr. Howe, whose youthful service in the war for the independence of Greece, recalling the stories of knight-errantry, has endeared his

name to two hemispheres, is yet better known by what he has done for those unfortunate classes of our fellow-men whom God has deprived of intellect or of sense. He gave eyes to the fingers of the blind, he taught the deaf and dumb articulate speech, waked the slumbering intellect in the darkened soul of the idiot, brought comfort, quiet, hope, courage, to the wretched cell of the insane.

To each of these the people of Massachusetts have, in their own way, paid their tribute of honor and reverence. The statue of Horace Mann stands by the portal of the State House. The muse of Whittier and Holmes, the lips of our most distinguished living orators, the genius of his gifted wife, have united in a worthy memorial of Howe. The stately eloquence of Sumner, in his great oration at Cambridge, has built a monument to Channing more enduring than marble or granite; but Channing's published writings, eagerly read wherever the English language prevails, are better than any monument.

Yet I believe Channing and Howe and Mann, were they living to-day, would themselves yield precedence to the constant and courageous heroism of him who said, "I am in earnest; I will not equivocate; I will not retreat a single inch; and I will be heard"; whose fame

"Over his living head, like heaven, is bent  
An early and eternal monument."

The Act of Congress limits the selection to deceased persons not exceeding two in number for each State. Massachusetts has chosen those who, while they seemed the fittest representatives of what is peculiar in her own character and history, have impressed that character on important public events which have been benefits to the nation at large.

That peculiarity is what is called Puritanism. To that principle, which I will try to define presently, I think it would not be difficult to trace nearly everything which Massachusetts has been able to achieve in any department of excellence. But it has a direct national importance in three conspicuous eras. One of them is too recent to allow of dispassionate consideration. The others are the eras of the foundation of the State and of the American Revolution.

Of the first, John Winthrop, twelve times governor of Massachusetts, from 1630 to 1649, is the best type. Of the second, she has selected Samuel Adams, sometimes called "the last of the Puritans," as the representative.

"The true marshalling," says Lord Bacon, "of the degrees of sovereign honor are these: In the first place are *conditores imperiorum*, founders of states and commonwealths, such as were

Romulus, Cyrus, Cæsar, Ottoman, Ismael." Whatever rank shall be assigned to our Commonwealth by history compared with the states of Romulus and Cyrus and the rest, the same "degree of sovereign honor" must be awarded to the man who founded it as compared with those named by Lord Bacon.

When you look upon the statue of John Winthrop, you see the foremost man of that little company of Englishmen who abandoned wealth, comfort, rank, to found a Christian church and a republican state in the wilderness of New England. He was born in Suffolk on the twelfth day of January, 1587. He was a gentleman of good estate and descent, and of wide and powerful family connection. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, bred to the bar, and had a considerable practice as an attorney of the court of wards and liveries. A large portion of his private papers and letters to his family and friends have been preserved. I know of no other man of his time of whose mental and spiritual life, from his childhood up, we have such full particulars. He was a man industrious, modest, wise, brave, generous, affectionate, a lover of home, of kindred and friends, tolerant, religious, moderate, chaste, temperate, self-sacrificing. He had studied the laws of England, and thought deeply and clearly upon the principles of civil liberty. He was a member and communicant of the Church of England. From his early youth his letters to his family and near friends and numerous private manuscripts, reveal his most secret religious meditations and aspirations. They breathe a sincere, liberal, catholic spirit of love to God and man, uttered in forms in which religious men of all denominations could unite. If these simple and eloquent utterances were found in a meditation of Pascal or A'Kempis, in a confession of Saint Augustine, in a sermon of Jeremy Taylor, in a journal of John Wesley, or an essay of Channing, I do not think that any disciple of either would deem them out of place. His style is simple and serious, rising sometimes to a grave and majestic eloquence. There are passages in his letters of exquisite beauty, and "in the loftiest strain of religious faith and devotional fervor." There was probably no man in England with tastes less inclined to the part of an adventurer, and with less personal ambition.

Such, in the year 1629, at the age of forty-three, was this model English gentleman, dwelling on his own landed estate, surrounded by affluence, engaged in honorable public employments, happy in home, friends, honor. He had heard of a rocky and ice-bound region, the gloom of whose eternal forests was tenanted by savage beasts and men more savage. He had heard of a little company of Englishmen who had landed on that coast ten years before, at mid-

winter, half of whom had perished before spring, "at one time only six or seven having strength enough left to nurse the dying and bury the dead," and who for ten years had maintained a precarious and doubtful struggle with famine and pestilence and the rigorous climate. But what should drive him, of all mankind, to leave the delights of rich and luxurious England, to abandon the pleasant vales of Suffolk, for the rocks and sands of Massachusetts? "Founders of states, such as were Romulus, Cyrus, Cæsar, Ottoman, Ismael." A founder of states *such as these were not* was John Winthrop. No legions flushed with foreign conquest demanded that he should lead them across the Rubicon to found an empire on the ruins of his country. No milk of the she-wolf mingling with the streams of his blood made him the fit founder of an asylum for a clan of banditti. No fanatical passion for conquest, no dream of sensual paradise, no restless nomadic habit, disturbed the even tenor of his life. But he was one of those men to whose happiness civil and religious liberty were absolutely essential. The third Parliament of Charles I. had just been dissolved. England was entering upon a period of ten years of absolute monarchy, her civil and military administration in the hands of Strafford, her spiritual affairs in the hands of Laud. Winthrop agreed in opinion with those who were disposed to submit to neither.

A charter had been earlier obtained. A few colonists had gone over to New England and established a government in subordination to the company in England. On the 26th day of August, 1629, Winthrop and eleven others signed an agreement at Cambridge "to embark for the said plantation, to the end to pass the seas (under God's protection) to inhabit and continue in New England; provided always, that the whole government, together with the patent for the said plantation, be first by an order of court legally transferred and established to remain with us and others which shall inhabit upon the said plantation." This condition was performed. In October thereafter the record of the company recites "the court having received extraordinary great commendations of Mr. John Winthrop, both for his integrity and sufficiency, as being one every way well fitted and accomplished for the place, the said Mr. Winthrop was with a general vote chosen to be governor for the ensuing year."

It is more than probable that the accession of Winthrop to their society was the condition of the whole emigration. It is more than probable that the coming over of Winthrop and his fleet of ships saved the whole Puritan settlement from being abandoned. It is certain that, for the nineteen years for which he was chief director of the affairs of the colony, he impressed upon it his own character

and qualities. He took farewell of England “in a flood of tears.” He begged his brethren of the English Church for their prayers, “which will be a most prosperous gale in our sails.” To narrate his remaining life would be only to tell again the well-known tale of the history of Massachusetts for its first nineteen years.

The qualities which the greatest rulers of free states have displayed in the most difficult times, were all needed in the governor of the infant Commonwealth. No other American so nearly resembles Washington. “He was, indeed,” says the old annalist, “a governor who had most exactly studied that book, which, pretending to teach politics, did only contain three leaves, and but one word on each of those leaves, which word was ‘moderation.’” Another Puritan writer calls him “that famous pattern of piety and justice.” He was reproved by the clergy of the colony for his “overmuch lenity,” in the month Roger Williams was banished. He preserved unbroken his friendship with Williams, who wished him to be the governor of his own plantation in Rhode Island. He poured out his estate in charity, leaving but £100 at his death. He gave his last measure of meal to a poor woman when the colony was starving, a ship laden with provisions from England arriving just in time for their safety.

When impeached for an act of necessary authority, he took his place modestly and meekly at the bar of the court of which he had been head, where he defended himself in a discourse defining the true nature of civil liberty, which, for grave and majestic eloquence, has been pronounced by high authority “equal to anything of antiquity.”

The questions which divided the Roundhead from the Cavalier, the Puritan from the High Churchman, are not yet at rest. Until they are, men will differ in their estimate of the generation to which John Winthrop belonged and of the Commonwealth of which he was the chief founder. But the concurrent judgment of all lovers of America now accepts the estimate which has been eloquently expressed by his distinguished biographer and descendant, your accomplished predecessor in that chair: “A great example of private virtue and public usefulness; of moderation in counsel and energy in action; of stern self-denial and unsparing self-devotion; of childlike trust in God and implicit faith in the gospel of Christ, united with courage enough for conducting a colony across the ocean and wisdom enough for building up a state in the wilderness.”

When John Winthrop died, in 1649, the colony of which he had been the foremost planter, was firmly established as a Christian state. Thirty flourishing towns, in which every freeman had an equal vote, were represented in the Legislature. The college, the

schools, the churches, agriculture, and trade and fisheries were prospering. The little Commonwealth did its full share to keep up the glory of the English flag at Louisburg, at Quebec, at Martinique, and the Havana, and many another well-fought field. But the people kept a weary lookout for any encroachment by king, Parliament, or governor, on the natural and inalienable rights of Englishmen, as declared by their charter. In 1763, the great drama was fairly opened, which ended with the separation from England and the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. The Legislature hesitated a good while whether Samuel Adams or his illustrious kinsman, John Adams, should be chosen as the representative of the revolutionary age. I think the even-hanging balance was inclined at last by the thought of the ample compensations which life brought to the latter for his services and sacrifices in his country's cause.

I can conceive of nothing which the human heart can desire in satisfaction of a pure ambition which did not fall to the lot of John Adams. As was well said by Mr. Webster, "he was attended through life by a great and fortunate genius. He had written his name where all nations should behold it, and where all time should not efface it." He lived to see the independence of his country achieved. His was the rare good fortune to take part in a great revolution from its beginning to its successful issue. The proscribed rebel was received by the sovereign who had hated him, as the representative of a great and free people. He was deemed by his countrymen worthy to be associated with Washington in the inauguration of the Government, and succeeded him in the great office of the Presidency. He was the foremost champion of the Declaration of Independence on the floor of Congress, and his famous prophecy will cause his name to be remembered by his countrymen, as its anniversary returns, until time shall be no more. He was the chief author of the constitution of his native State. He rejoiced in the congenial companionship of one of the most affectionate of wives and most intellectual of women. His life ended on the spot where it began, at the great age of ninety, in a strong, vigorous old age, made happy by private affection and public reverence. By a coincidence almost miraculous, his death took place when millions of his countrymen, happy and at peace, under the Presidency of his son, were celebrating the great day he had made famous. "If the chariot and horses of fire had been vouchsafed to him, he could scarcely have had a more splendid translation, or departed in a brighter blaze of glory."

Samuel Adams, on the other hand, lived and died poor. His only son preceded him to the grave, leaving none to inherit his name.

He held no considerable public office, except that of delegate to the Continental Congress, until he succeeded Hancock as governor in his seventy-second year, when in his own opinion the weight of years and infirmities was beginning to unfit him for further service.

But for more than thirty years, beginning when most of the great actors in the Revolution were unborn or were children, he was the unquestioned leader of the contest for liberty in Massachusetts. I shall not repeat the familiar story. Samuel Adams was, I think, the greatest of our American public men in civil life; greatest, if we judge him by the soundness and sureness of his opinions on the great questions of his time and of all time; greatest, as shown by the strength of original argument by which he persuaded the people to its good; greatest in the imperial power of personal will by which he inspired and compelled and subdued the statesmen of his day who were his companions; greatest in the sublime self-denial which contented itself with accomplishing public results without seeking personal reward either of fame or office.

“If there was any Palinurus to the Revolution,” said Thomas Jefferson, “Samuel Adams was that man.” From the day when on taking his degrees at Harvard, in 1743, he maintained that it is lawful to resist the supreme magistrate if the commonwealth cannot otherwise be preserved, down to the time when the Declaration severed the tie between England and the colonies, he conducted the great debate of liberty. In the achievement of great revolutions which mark and secure the progress of liberty, three kinds of leaders are alike indispensable: the philosopher, who establishes great principles; the statesman, who frames great measures, fills great executive offices, leads popular and legislative assemblies; the politician, without whose marshalling of political forces civil contests must be carried on by the mobs, and not by parties. Adams was all three. With clear logic, he derived his great argument from its foundations in the immovable laws of ethics and the inalienable rights of human nature. With consummate wisdom, he directed all the measures of the Massachusetts Assembly, never driven from his position or taking a false step. He was the most dexterous politician that ever planned an election or managed a caucus. He laid down the pen in the midst of a profound treatise, which Locke or Hooker might have envied, to mingle with the workmen at the rope-walk or the crowd at the street corner to plan the conduct of the coming town-meeting. I know no second instance in history where these three characters have been so wonderfully combined. Yet, what is more wonderful still, Adams was free from the faults which commonly beset each. A profound political philosopher, his feet always touched the ground. He was never led astray by his theory.

A statesman, he was without personal ambition. A politician, he was without a wile. There is no more hurtful error than the notion of our *doctrinaires* that the function performed in free states by men who are termed politicians is not dignified, honorable, serviceable, and honest. When wars are brought to successful issue without planning the campaigns; when battles are won without generals, disposition of forces, or discipline, good results will come to pass under popular governments without politicians. But whether concerting his plans in the caucus or addressing the people in Faneuil Hall, which was called his "throne," the absolute truth and simple honesty of Samuel Adams were unstained. He would not have deceived that people if thereby he could have redeemed a world from bondage.

With unerring wisdom, earlier than any other person in his own State, he saw the principles on which the American cause was based, and the means by which public opinion should be convinced, combined and made effective in their support. He saw the power of the newspaper when it was almost unused as a political force. He was the author of the most important state papers, the instructions of the town of Boston to its representatives, of the assembly to its agents in England, its answers to the royal governors, wherein the natural rights of men, the chartered privileges of the people, and the limits of executive and legislative power were established on foundations from which they have never been removed. It was said of him that he had the eyes of Argus and as many hands as Briareus, and in each hand a pen. His style was simple, severe, chaste, restrained, as became the great themes he had to discuss. But it conveyed his weighty meaning alike to the understanding of the people and the apprehension of his antagonists. "Every dip of his pen," said Bernard, "stung like a horned snake."

He always put other men forward when glory was to be gained or desirable public offices to be filled—never when responsibility or peril was to be encountered. Behind the conspicuous presence of Hancock, the brilliant rhetoric of Otis, the British governors felt and dreaded the iron hand of Adams. With his own lips he gave the signal for the movement of the tea party. With his own hand he carried to the council the impeachment of Oliver. On the day of the Boston massacre, Adams intrusted no other messenger with the demand for the removal of the regiments. Yonder statue represents the great popular leader and chieftain, king of men, the genius of American liberty speaking through his lips, as he stood in the presence of the royalty of England represented by Governor Hutchinson: "If you have the power to remove one regiment you have power to remove both. It is at your peril if you refuse. Night is approaching; an

immediate answer is expected. Both regiments or none!" "It was then," said Adams afterward, "if fancy deceived me not, that I observed his knees to tremble. I thought I saw his face grow pale, and I enjoyed the sight."

He was almost the earliest of American advocates, I think in nearly every case the earliest, of doctrines which, when he first uttered them, were deemed paradoxes or Utopian dreams, but to-day are the accepted maxims of constitutional liberty. Among these he maintained that the right to life, liberty, and property are essential and inalienable rights of human nature;

That Magna Charta is irrepealable by Parliament (citing in support of this view the curse pronounced by the church in presence of King Henry III. and the estates of the realm upon all who should make statutes or observe them contrary to it);

That representation of America in Parliament was impossible;

That king or Parliament, together or separately, had no right to affect the liberties of the colonies;

That, therefore, Parliament had no power to legislate for the colonies in any case;

That the union of the several powers of government in one person is dangerous to liberty;

That the Crown had no right to grant salaries to colonial judges or governors;

That kings and governors may be guilty of treason and rebellion, and have in general been more guilty of them than their subjects;

That the welfare and safety of the people are paramount to all other law;

That governments are founded on equal rights;

That the people have natural right to change a bad constitution whenever it is in their power;

That American manufactures should be a constant theme.

"He was never weary," says his biographer, "of promoting a widely diffused common-school system, whereby the poorest might educate his children to a point where talent might win its way on equal terms with their more wealthy neighbors. This was democratic doctrine in its purest form, and, as Mr. Adams conceived it, was the principle on which the Revolution had been accomplished."

The instinct of Hutchinson did not err when it pronounced him the first man in America who advocated independence.

The first public denial of the right of Parliament to tax America, the first public opposition to the Stamp Act, the first suggestion of a general union of the colonies, are in the instruction of the town of Boston to its representatives, adopted in 1764 and drafted by Samuel Adams. This preceded by twelve months Patrick Henry's resolu-

tion in the Virginia House of Burgesses of May, 1765. In that life of incessant activity, constantly engaged in debate in the assembly, in controversy in the press, a writer of such originality that the doctrines must have seemed to the men of his day paradoxes, having to meet a powerful and unscrupulous government by combining popular forces, no instance can be found of his advancing a doctrine which is not to-day accepted, or of his proposing a measure from which he was compelled to recede.

It has been charged that the "glittering generalities" of the Declaration of Independence were the result of the French tastes of Jefferson, and were acquiesced in—not believed in—by his associates in the Continental Congress to conciliate his supposed influence in Virginia. The criticism has been made by Mazzini, I think repeated by Bismarck, that it asserts that the security of rights, not the performance of duties, is the object of the state. The statement and the criticism are alike unfounded. Every sentiment of the Declaration can be found anticipated in the writings of Samuel Adams. It contains the matured opinions of the most religious race of men that ever lived at the most religious period of their history. The men who believed that "the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever" did not lightly put on record their creed as to the object of the state and the purpose for which governments are instituted among men. They knew that to add a political sanction to religious or moral duty, or to enlist the forces of the state for its performance, is impossible, without trenching upon that liberty of conscience which they valued even more than their political rights.

Burke, in his famous delineation of the character of the colonists in his great speech on conciliation with America, mentions as among the marvels of history the formation of voluntary government by the people when the ancient government of Massachusetts was abrogated by Great Britain. That voluntary government, obeyed, as Lord Dunmore said of that in Virginia, "infinitely better than the ancient ever was in its most fortunate periods," was largely the work of Samuel Adams.

His respect for law and horror for lawless violence were remarkable in the leader of a revolution. When the mob attacked the house of Hutchinson he declared he would rather have lost his right hand. It was through his influence that Quincy and John Adams defended Captain Preston, and the soldiers who had fired on the people, and secured their acquittal. He restrained the impatience of the people, waiting patiently for eight years till the time should come when his opponents should be put clearly in the wrong by first resorting to force.

He had a marvellous personal magnetism which few men could

resist, by which he attracted many brilliant and able men to the cause of his country. John Adams declares in his diary that "to my certain knowledge, from 1758 to 1775, that is, for seventeen years he made it his constant rule to watch the rise of every brilliant genius, to seek his acquaintance, to court his friendship, to cultivate his natural feelings in favor of his native country, to warn him against the hostile designs of Great Britain." He gives us a few names out of many thus brought to the cause of America,—Hancock, Warren, and Quincy. To these names he might have added his own, as abundant passages in his diary bear witness.

Samuel Adams seems to have been a man without a selfish personal desire. You cannot trace in him the slightest evidence of the passions that so commonly beset the path of men in public life. The love of fame, the love of money, the love of pleasure, the love of ease, the love of power, the love of office, were alike without influence on that heart in which the love of liberty burned with a perpetual flame. The authorship of many of his ablest papers remained unknown till long after he died. The agents of the king more than once tried to tempt him with money or office. Most of his companions in the public service found means to gain competent fortunes by their own industry. Adams once declared that a guinea never glistened in his eyes. But for a small inheritance received late in life from his son, he must have been supported in his old age by charity and buried at the public charge. His only relaxation from his unrepaid public cares was in conversation, especially with little children, of whose society he was passionately fond, and sometimes in listening to or joining in sacred music, in which he especially delighted.

The judgment of historians, the voice of the people, the praises of friends, the anger of enemies, bear concurrent witness to the great qualities of Samuel Adams.

Bancroft calls him "the Chief of the Revolution." He says, "His vigorous, manly will resembled in its tenacity well-tempered steel which may ply a little but will not break."

James Grahame says, "Samuel Adams was one of the most perfect models of disinterested patriotism, and of republican genius and character, in all its austerity and simplicity, that any age or country has ever produced."

Jefferson called him "the Palinurus of the Revolution." He declared "he was truly a great man, wise in counsel, fertile in his resources, immovable in his purposes, and had, I think, a greater share than any other member in advising and directing our measures in the northern war. I always considered him more than any other man the fountain of our important measures."

Patrick Henry writes from Williamsburg, when Virginia was

about to frame her constitution, "Would to God you and your Samuel Adams were here."

James Warren said he was "the man who had the greatest hand in the greatest revolution in the world."

John Adams exhausts the language of eulogy in his praise: "He has the most thorough understanding of liberty and her resources in the temper and character of the people. He was born and tempered a wedge of steel."

Stephen Sayre calls him "the Father of America."

Josiah Quincy says, "Many in England esteem him the first politician in the world."

A distinguished clergyman of his time calls him "one of Plutarch's men."

Hutchinson, the tory governor, calls him "the all in all," "the great incendiary leader of Boston." When the ministry wrote to Hutchinson, "Why has not Mr. Adams been taken off from his opposition by an office?" he replied, "Such is the obstinacy and inflexible disposition of the man that he never would be conciliated by any office or gift whatever." When Hutchinson went back to England he was received to an audience by King George in his closet, where king and governor vied with each other in denunciation of Sam. Adams.

Galloway, the Philadelphia tory, declared in his examination before the House of Commons that "the lower ranks in Philadelphia were governed in a great degree by Mr. Adams."

Gage, in June, 1775, excepts from the general offer of pardon "Samuel Adams and John Hancock, whose offences are of too flagitious a nature to admit of any other consideration than that of condign punishment."

And so, Mr. Speaker, it has come to pass that, in the centennial year, Massachusetts brings the first and last of her great Puritans to represent her in the nation's gallery of heroes and patriots. Two hundred and forty-six years have gone by since John Winthrop landed at Salem. It is a hundred years since Samuel Adams set his name at Philadelphia to the charter of that independence which it had been the great purpose of his life to accomplish. Their characters, public and private, have been the subject of an intense historic scrutiny, both hostile and friendly. But the State, not, we hope, having failed to learn whatever new lessons these centuries have brought, still adopts them as the best she has to offer.

I do not use the word Puritan in a restricted sense. I do not mean the bigots or zealots who were the caricature of their generation. I do not discuss the place in history of the men of the English commonwealth. Whether the hypocritical buffoon of Hudibras or

the religious enthusiast of Macaulay be the type of that generation of Englishmen before whom Europe trembles, we do not need to inquire. I use the word in a large sense, as comprehending the men who led the emigration, made up the bulk of the numbers, established the institutions of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Plymouth, and administered their affairs as self-governing republics in all but name for more than a century and a half.

Through the vast spaces of human history there have resounded but a few heroic strains. Unless the judgment of those writers who have best conceived and pictured heroism—Milton, Burke, Carlyle, Froude—be at fault, among these there has been none loftier than the Puritanism of New England. The impress which a man makes upon mankind depends upon what he believes, what he loves, what are his qualities of intellect and of temper. You must consider all these to form a just estimate of the great generations with which we are dealing. The Puritan loved liberty, religious and civil; he loved home and family and friends and country with a love never surpassed; and he loved God. He did not love pleasure or luxury or mirth. He dwelt with the delight of absolute certainty on the anticipation of a life beyond the grave. His intellect was fit for exact ethical discussion, clear in seeing general truths, active, unresting, fond of inquiry and debate, but penetrated and restrained by a shrewd common-sense. He saw with absolute clearness the true boundary which separates liberty and authority in the state. He had a genius for making constitutions and statutes. He had a tenacity of purpose, a lofty and inflexible courage, an unbending will, which never quailed or flinched before human antagonist, or before exile, torture, or death. The Puritan was a thorough gentleman, of dignified, noble, stately bearing, as becomes men who bear weighty responsibilities, deal with the greatest interests, and meditate on the loftiest themes. Read John Winthrop's definition of civil liberty, or his reasons for settling in New England, and judge of the temper of those men, who, of free choice, made him twelve times their governor.

The Puritan believed that the law of God is the rule of life for states as for men. He believed in the independence of the individual conscience, and in self-government according to the precedents of English liberty, because he believed that both were according to the will of God. "It is the glory of the British constitution," said Samuel Adams, "that it hath its foundation in the law of God." "The magistrate is the servant," said John Adams, "not of his own desires, not even of the people, but of his God." He derived the knowledge of that will from a literal interpretation of Scripture, which he thought furnished precepts or examples for every occa-

sion. Yet it is wonderful how soon the common-sense of the Puritan wrought out the principles of sound administration, and freed him from the errors into which other men fell. He interpreted literally the divine command, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Yet the witchcraft delusion, disgrace of all Christian nations, never reached Plymouth or Connecticut, and touched Massachusetts but lightly. In England, from 1600 to 1680, 40,000 persons were put to death as witches, and in Scotland nearly as many. On the continent of Europe the victims were murdered by hundreds of thousands. In Massachusetts the number never reached a score. The little Swiss city of Geneva put to death five hundred persons for this crime in a single year. A child of nine years old was executed for witchcraft in Huntingdon, England, in 1719. The laws against witchcraft remained in force in England till 1736, and in Scotland till 1738, fifty years after the time, when, first of all mankind, Massachusetts repented of the delusion, the opinion of her whole people being uttered in the ever-memorable confession of Sewall, the Puritan chief justice. They had sacrificed almost everything else that man values to enjoy the worship of God after their own fashion. Yet they were among the first of mankind to establish complete religious toleration. I have heard the Puritans of New England taunted for religious bigotry by the representatives of States who, as late as 1741, put men to death for the crime of being Catholics.

The Puritan believed in a future life, where just men were to enjoy immortality with those whom they had loved here; and this belief was his comfort and support in all the sorrow and suffering which he had encountered. But he believed also in the coming of God's kingdom here. He had a firm faith that the state he had builded was to continue and grow, a community of men living together in the practice of virtue, in the worship of God, in the pursuit of truth. It has been said of each of two great Puritan leaders, "Hope shone like a fiery pillar in him when it had gone out in all others. His mind is firmly fixed on the future; his face is radiant with the sunrise he intently watches."

Lastly, the Puritan believed in the law of righteous retribution in the affairs of nations. No departure from God's law of absolute justice, of absolute honesty, of absolute righteousness, could escape, so it seemed to him, its certain and terrible punishment. The oppressor who deprived the poorest or weakest of mankind of the equal right with which God had endowed him, the promise-breaker who juggled with public obligation, the man who gained power by violence or fraud, brought down, as he believed, the vengeance of God upon himself and upon his children, and upon the nation which permitted him, to the third and fourth generation.

Mr. Speaker, the State that the Puritan planted has opened her gates to men of other lineage and of other creed. It may be that in the coming centuries his descendants are to yield to another race the dominion of his beloved New England, and that only in gentler climes, and on the shores of a more pacific sea, men will delight to remember that their fathers were of the company of Winthrop, or sat in counsel with Adams. But the title of the Puritan to remembrance will not depend upon locality. In that mightier national life, drawn from so many sources,—of many, one ; of many States, one nation ; of many races, one people ; of many creeds, one faith,—the elements he has contributed are elements of perpetual power: his courage ; his constancy ; his belief in God ; his reverence for law ; his love of liberty ; his serene and lofty hope. [Applause.]

#### REMARKS OF HON. W. W. WARREN OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. WARREN. Massachusetts presents to the United States the statues of two of her representative men. She has selected for her heroes no brilliant but erratic genius,—general, orator, or poet, for a time the wonder of mankind,—but two men, each of whom owes his fame to the unselfish devotion of a lifetime to the cause in which his youth embarked. Not that they were either of them common men. Both were born leaders. They were men of unusual firmness and persistency ; both men who scorned to be turned aside from the work to which they had dedicated their lives by any thought of personal gain, or office, or honor. But their right of leadership was built upon the fact that in themselves they embodied and illustrated the most powerful moving sentiments of the time in which they each of them lived.

We must leave out of view, when we would ascertain what, at a given epoch, is the most powerful influence that is operating to shape or transform the political or religious life of a country, all that large class—the majority, in fact, of its people—who give no time to thought, and readily subscribe to whatever dogmas in polities or religion may be current, so long as the trade in silks or woollens, in corn or cotton, is active and remunerative. Such are not the men whose acts and whose will overturn empires, reform religions, and lead mankind in new paths of progress. Such are not the men who are troubled about the shortcomings of the dominant church, or who tremble at the first insidious attacks made by power upon liberty. But we who are of English stock may make it our boast that in each succeeding age a large body of the people, in all classes in society, have acknowledged the duty they owed to the church and to the state, to keep the first pure and the second true to the great charter of liberties.

The leaders of thought, and afterward in action, must clearly perceive the danger to be overcome, whether it arises from the perversity of those intrusted with power, or the indifference of the people ; must devise the remedy, and combine and marshal the forces necessary to uproot the prevailing wrong, and create or renew correct opinions and practices in religion or politics.

We need not be reminded that from the time when John Winthrop attained his manhood, down to the day of his death, one strong purpose animated and controlled the serious and solid men of England. I do full justice to the manly and chivalrous devotion of the Cavaliers to the throne, to the zeal and love of the Churchmen for the established religion. But the men who beheaded a Strafford, who overthrew a Laud, who conquered a monarch and established two commonwealths : one at home, ill-conditioned and short-lived, the other, *esto perpetua*, on these shores, were the men that impressed themselves on their age, and have left their impress upon all future generations. They were the men who saw and believed that their liberties, civil and religious, were in danger ; who knew no duty but in attempting to recover their rights. In the mind and character of some, the religious element predominated ; in others, the determination to recover the ancient rights and privileges of the British subject was the ruling motive. But among all who were active on the side of the people in the stirring events of that time, both motives combined.

I know how unsafe it is to generalize on any historical subject. What is gained in point and effect is lost in accuracy. But it is not too much to assert that the revolution against the kingly power owed its commencement to those who, while sufficiently religious, yet felt most keenly the wrong done by the king to the civil and political rights of the subject ; while, on the other hand, the founding of the Massachusetts Commonwealth was due to those who, not unmindful of the danger to political liberty, were impelled primarily by their belief that their foremost duty was to bring their lives into absolute subjection to the will of God. The latter subordinated their duty to the state, yes, and the state itself, to what they conceived to be the law of God. The former had, from education, from family, and from tradition, the almost superstitious veneration for what was termed the constitutional rights of Englishmen, which made them start at any infraction of the provisions of that constitution, and eventually take arms in defence of its integrity. And it is a singular fact that when the revolution against the power of the king, commenced by the friends of civil liberty, was well-nigh failing, it owed its revival and ultimate success to the strength that was imparted to it by those whose ruling motive was the religious one.

For it was Cromwell and Ireton, and the men who prepared for the fight by prayer, who proved invincible to all the dash and impetuosity of Rupert and his squadrons. On the other hand,—I trust it is not a fanciful comparison,—our colony, founded by John Winthrop, and for over a century sustained by the influence of him, and men like him, who would use the state itself only as a means to glorify God, and make all men keep his commandments, never reached its full stature as a perfect commonwealth until new encroachments upon political rights caused the descendants of the Puritans to turn their whole attention to the preservation of their liberties. Then, as John Winthrop, the representative man of his day, was chosen by his peculiar fitness to lead a devoted band to build up the church in the wilderness, so Samuel Adams, equally the representative of the men of his time, was at once recognized as the one man fitted to lead in the work of the new revolution against royal aggression.

It derogates nothing from the merit of Winthrop or Adams that each was the product of the time in which he lived. It rather heightens their claim to the gratitude and reverent regard of their contemporaries and of posterity that they possessed the clearness of vision to understand and the forgetfulness of self and firmness of purpose to carry into execution the best if not the only measures which would secure in the earlier time the religious independence and in the later period the civil and political freedom which of right belonged to all freeborn Englishmen.

As in the mother country the love of freedom needed the aid of religious zeal before it could succeed in its struggle against power, so on the other hand in the *New England* its religious zeal and constancy needed the liberalizing aid of the spirit of democracy in order that full freedom of conscience in things religious might be guaranteed to all men. And so Massachusetts regards herself to-day as built upon the two foundations of religion and of liberty. In her belief, one cannot exist apart from the other. Religion is the main reliance to prevent liberty from degenerating into license. A devotion to liberty and the equal rights of all will alone guarantee that toleration without which religion itself becomes a matter of form or an engine of oppression.

It is most fitting, then, that Massachusetts should present to the United States the statues of Winthrop and of Samuel Adams. The one is the true type of the religious element,—controlling but never dwarfing the love of freedom; the other, the full embodiment of the spirit of liberty,—active, zealous, yet always relying on the sanction of the divine law; both together represent the Common-

wealth itself, the perfect result of the full blending of religion and liberty, working in harmony in the cause of human progress.

It is not for me to present to you an analysis of the characteristics of the Puritans, or to show in what manner and by the possession of what qualities they have exerted so great an influence upon the fortunes of our country. If I desired I could add nothing to the completeness of the picture drawn by my colleague who has preceded me. I should only mar the beauty and symmetry of his portraiture were I to add so much as a single touch. Let me rather say, that whatever may have been the rivalries between the Puritans and Pilgrims, or between the early settlers of New England and those of more southern colonies, the differences between them bear no comparison to the points of similarity. Wherever we turn, in the history of Massachusetts or Virginia, we shall find all through its pages the evidence that the people of both States descended from a common stock; that both made it their chief boast that the ancient rights and privileges of Englishmen were theirs; that when freedom was assailed both sprang with equal alacrity to its defence; that, when both had shaken off the shackles of colonial dependence and came to adopt a declaration of rights and a frame of government suited to a free people, the constitutions of Massachusetts and of Virginia differed in no essential particular; and that in the task of establishing the Federal Union for the common defence against foreign enemies and the common security against domestic violence, while at the same time the States and the people were guaranteed the rights essential to the preservation of liberty, Samuel Adams of Massachusetts and Thomas Jefferson of Virginia found themselves in perfect accord.

In the next place I do not dwell upon the contrasts that may be discovered between the colonists of 1630 and the revolutionists of 1775. There was never a time when religious zeal was powerful enough in the colony to cause the people or the magistrates to lose sight of the great bulwarks of civil freedom. The principles and forms of the common law were constantly followed. The Parliament was supported in its contest with the king. And from first to last there was manifested a firm determination to insist on all the rights and the substantial independence conferred by the original charter of the company.

On the other hand, at the time of the Revolution and long after, the power and the influence of the clergy were felt in state as well as church, and the habit of referring to the words of Scripture as authority in things temporal as well as in things spiritual was almost universal. For two centuries at least after the first settlement of Boston, the building up of the church and the preservation of their

liberties were the prime motives that inspired the conduct of the men of Massachusetts. At one time one motive predominated, at another the other, but both were always active.

I have said that these men owe their fame not to any single brilliant exploit. It is, on the other hand, only by the well-rounded work of a lifetime that they so truly represent two centuries of Massachusetts history. But not only because they best illustrate the times in which they lived, but also because they most clearly fore-saw what was needed in the future of their country, it is proper that their statues should have an honorable place among those contributed to our National Gallery. In these days, when office is without honor, when the possession of wealth is almost of itself a ground of suspicion against its possessor, and when culture instead of conferring strength is too often only a badge of inefficiency, one can but be struck by the contrast which the first and second centuries of our history present to the present time.

In John Winthrop were united social station, official rank, refined culture, and, until late in life, a sufficient fortune. Adams was undoubtedly a man most democratic in his tendencies; yet in his day due respect was rendered to the magistrates; honor to the man of learning and wealth was esteemed as the fair reward of honest and patient endeavor. In these respects Winthrop and Adams but reflect the habits of their own times. But a public man's influence upon posterity depends upon what he has thought out and wisely said in the way of solving the political, religious, or social problems with which the future must deal.

In Winthrop's time it was hoped and believed that the colonial charter contained a sufficient guarantee for the substantial independence of the colony. It was not then deemed either desirable or practicable to bring about a complete separation from the mother country; yet every step taken by Winthrop and his contemporaries was preparatory to the actual and complete independence which was to follow. Before his death, Winthrop witnessed the entire success of his enterprise, and he had been mainly instrumental in giving such a foundation and such a direction to the public sentiment of the people as would keep the rising state always in the path which he had marked out for it when he determined on removing to the New World.

Adams, when he came upon the stage, had another century of the experience of England and the colony on which to draw for instruction. He could also learn from the development of the country, and from its constant disputes with the home government, what its future must be, and what the basis on which government here must rest.

His views were always singularly clear, and those of his earlier

years required little modification even in his old age. Hear him, at the age of twenty-six, discussing what is true loyalty :—

“ The true object of loyalty is a good, legal constitution, which, as it condemns every instance of oppression and lawless power, derives a certain remedy to the sufferer by allowing him to remonstrate his grievances, and pointing out methods of relief when the gentle arts of persuasion have lost their efficacy. Whoever, therefore, insinuates notions of government contrary to the Constitution, or in any degree winks at any measure to suppress or even to weaken it, is not a loyal man. Whoever acquaints us that we have no right to examine into the conduct of those who, though they derive their power from us to serve the common interests, made use of it to impoverish and ruin us, is, in a degree, a rebel—to the undoubted rights and liberties of the people.”

This was in 1748. Twenty years later, when troops were stationed in Boston, and their removal was demanded by the citizens, Adams thus wrote to the “ Boston Gazette ” :—

“ Where military power is introduced, military maxims are propagated and adopted which are inconsistent with, and must soon eradicate, every idea of civil government. Do we not already find some persons weak enough to believe that an officer is obliged to obey the order of his superior, though it be even against the law? And let any one consider whether this doctrine does not directly lead even to the setting up of that officer, whoever he may be, as a tyrant?”

I may not go on with quotations.

For over a quarter of a century after this he continued in public life, and so long he continued to repeat and enforce his arguments in favor of a constitutional government, based upon universal liberty, and secured by the safeguards of religion and popular education.

So Massachusetts, in presenting these statues, presents herself again to the United States. She claims for her people that, recognizing the merits of these two men, she recognizes the truths for the sake of which they spent their lives, and she promises for herself that she will not fail in religiously performing every constitutional duty. Whenever an attempt shall be made to subvert our institutions, whether by the reckless employment of force or by a resort to the subtler method of deception and fraud practised on the people, Massachusetts must forget her traditions and her memories if she fails to be the first in the field to resist all illegal conduct and protect the rights of her citizens.

She has placed these statues on either side of the entrance to that hall where in a later day another Adams fell at his post of duty, so that we, who in these busy and perhaps most critical times are sent here to do what in us lies to preserve and transmit unimpaired that constitutional liberty which is our inheritance, must, in going out

from this hall after our daily service, pass between the silent forms of Winthrop and of Adams.

Whatever son of Massachusetts can leave this hall with the consciousness that in act or vote or speech he has been true to the ancient renown of his State, has resisted every attempt to subvert the principles on which the permanence of our liberties depends, has religiously held his allegiance to truth and firmly opposed all falsehood and fraud and trickery, has not forgotten his country in his zeal for party, nor forfeited his self-respect and the respect of good men by his desire for office and personal gain; finally, who has imitated the life and conduct of these two men, whose example we offer to the imitation of all lovers of free government, may hold his head erect, and look full in the face those almost speaking statues, and feel as if a blessing were resting upon his pathway.

But if at any time any recreant son of the old Commonwealth should dare to use his position here to undermine the institutions of his country, to stifle the voice of a free people through the instrumentality of fraud or force, or both combined, should use his office for personal gain, or to secure a party triumph at the sacrifice of truth and of justice, then I fancy I see a man, as he passes out of yonder portal, crouching between the stately images at which he dares not look, and as if expecting the marble lips to part and utter the curse which he so well would merit. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, up to this day, as the virtues and merits of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams have never been unrecognized, so in each generation since his death some descendant of Winthrop and for four generations some kinsman of Adams has filled an honorable place in the service of the State. Far distant be the day when any future generation in the old Commonwealth shall be deprived of the service of a Winthrop or an Adams. Far distant be the day when there shall be wanting many, many descendants of the early Puritans who will be prompt to do honor to the memory and imitate the unselfish devotion to duty of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams. [Applause.]

#### REMARKS OF HON. JAMES A. GARFIELD, OF OHIO.

Mr. GARFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I regret that illness has made it impossible for me to keep the promise which I made a few days since to offer some reflections appropriate to this very interesting occasion. But I cannot let the moment pass without expressing my great satisfaction with the fitting and instructive choice which the State of Massachusetts has made, and the manner in which her representatives have discharged their duty in presenting these beautiful works of art to the Congress of the nation.

As from time to time our venerable and beautiful hall has been peopled with statues of the elect of the States, it has seemed to me that a third house was being organized within the walls of the Capitol,—a house whose members have received their high credentials at the hands of history, and whose term of office will outlast the ages. Year by year we see the circle of its immortal membership enlarging; year by year we see the elect of their country, in eloquent silence, taking the places in this American Pantheon, bringing within its sacred circle the wealth of those immortal memories which made their lives illustrious; year by year this august assembly is teaching a deeper and grander lesson to all who serve their brief hour in these more ephemeral houses of Congress. And now two places of great honor have just been most nobly filled.

I can well understand how the State of Massachusetts, embarrassed by her wealth of historic glory, found it difficult to make the selection. And while the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Hoar] was so fittingly honoring his State by portraying that happy embarrassment, I was reflecting that the sister State of Virginia will encounter, if possible, a still greater difficulty, when she comes to make the selection of her immortals. One name I venture to hope she will not select; a name too great for the glory of any one State. I trust she will allow us to claim Washington as belonging to all the States for all time. But if she should pass over the great distance that separates Washington from all others, I can hardly imagine how she will make her choice from her crowded roll. But I have no doubt that she will be able to present two who will represent the great phases of her history as happily and worthily as Massachusetts is represented in the choice she has to-day announced. It is difficult to imagine a happier combination of great and beneficent forces than will be presented by the representative heroes of these two great States.

Virginia and Massachusetts were the two focal centres from which sprang the life-forces of this Republic. They were in many ways complements of each other, each supplying what the other lacked, and both uniting to endow the Republic with its noblest and most enduring qualities.

To-day the House has listened with the deepest interest to the statement of those elements of priceless value contributed by the State of Massachusetts. We have been instructed by the clear and masterly analysis of the spirit and character of that Puritan civilization so fully embodied in the lives of Winthrop and Adams. I will venture to add, that, notwithstanding all the neglect and contempt with which England regarded her Puritans two hundred years ago, the tendency of thought in modern England is to do

justice to that great force that created the Commonwealth, and finally made the British islands a land of liberty and law. Even the great historian Hume was compelled reluctantly to declare that—

“The precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved by the Puritans alone; and it was to this sect that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution.”

What higher praise can posterity bestow upon any people than to make such a confession? Having done so much to save liberty alive in the mother country, the Puritans planted upon the shores of this New World that remarkable civilization whose growth is the greatness and glory of our Republic.

Indeed, before Winthrop and his company landed at Salem, the Pilgrims were laying the foundations of civil liberty. While the Mayflower was passing Cape Cod, and seeking an anchorage in the midst of the storm, her brave passengers sat down in the little cabin and drafted and signed a covenant which contains the germ of American liberty. How familiar to the American habit of mind are these declarations of the Pilgrim covenant of 1620:—

“That no act, imposition, law or ordinance be made or imposed upon us at present or to come but such as has been or shall be enacted by the consent of the body of freemen or associates, or their representatives legally assembled.”

The New England town was the model, the primary cell from which our Republic was evolved. The town-meeting was the germ of all the parliamentary life and habits of Americans.

John Winthrop brought with him the more formal organization of New England society, and in his long and useful life did more than perhaps any other to direct and strengthen its growth.

Nothing, therefore, would be more fitting than that Massachusetts should place in our Memorial Hall the statue of the first of the Puritans, representing him at the moment when he was stepping on shore from the ship that brought him from England, and bearing with him the charter of that first political society which laid the foundations of our country, and that near him should stand that Puritan embodiment of the logic of the Revolution, Samuel Adams. I am glad to see this decisive, though tardy, acknowledgment of his great and signal services to America. I doubt if any man equalled Samuel Adams in formulating and uttering the fierce, clear, and inexorable logic of the Revolution. With our present habits of thought, we can hardly realize how great were the obstacles to overcome. Not the least was the religious belief of the fathers,—that

allegiance to rulers was obedience to God. The thirteenth chapter of Romans was to many minds a barrier against revolution stronger than the battalions of George III. :—

“ Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.”

And it was not until the people of that religious age were led to see that they might obey God, and still establish liberty in spite of kingly despotism, that they were willing to engage in war against one who called himself “ king by the grace of God.” The men who pointed out the pathway to freedom by the light of religion as well as of law, were the foremost promoters of American independence. And of these, Adams was unquestionably chief.

It must not be forgotten that while Samuel Adams was writing the great argument of liberty in Boston, almost at the same time Patrick Henry was formulating the same doctrines in Virginia. It is one of the grandest facts of that grand time that the Colonies were thus brought by an almost universal consent to tread the same pathways and reach the same great conclusions.

But most remarkable of all is the fact that throughout all that period, filled as it was with the revolutionary spirit, the great men that guided the storm exhibited the most wonderful power of self-restraint. If I were to-day to state the single quality that appears to me most admirable among the fathers of the Revolution, I should say it was this: that in all the passions of war, waged against a perfidious enemy from beyond the sea, aided by a savage enemy on our own shores, our fathers exhibited so wonderful a restraint, so great a care to observe the forms of law, to protect the rights of the minority, to preserve all those great rights that have come down to them from the common law, so that when they had achieved their independence, they were still a law-abiding people.

In that fiery meeting in the Old South Church, after the Boston massacre, when, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, three thousand voices almost lifted the roof from the church in demanding the removal of the regiment, it is noted by the historian that there was one solitary sturdy nay in the vast assemblage, and Samuel Adams scrupulously recorded the fact that there was one dissentient. It would have been a mortal offence against his notions of justice and good order if that one dissentient had not had his place in the record. And after the regiments had been removed, and after the demands had been acceded to, that the soldiers who had fired upon citizens should be delivered over to the civil authorities to be dealt with according to law, Adams was the first man to

insist and demand that the best legal talent in the colony should be put forward to defend these murderers, and John Adams and Josiah Quincy were detailed for the purpose of defending them. Men were detailed whose hearts and souls were on fire with love for the popular cause ; but the men of Massachusetts would have despised these two advocates if they had not given their whole strength to the defence of the soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, this great lesson of self-restraint is taught in the whole history of the Revolution ; and it is this lesson that to-day, more, perhaps, than any we have seen, we ought to take most to heart. Let us seek liberty and peace, under the law, and, following the pathway of our fathers, preserve the legacy they have committed to our keeping.

The question being taken, the Resolutions of the Senate were unanimously concurred in.









W







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 012 723 1

